arXiv:math/0702292v3 [math.LO] 16 Jun 2010

DEPENDENT THEORIES AND THE GENERIC PAIR CONJECTURE

SAHARON SHELAH

Abstract. On the one hand we try to understand complete types over a somewhat saturated model of a complete first order theory which is dependent, by "decomposition theorems for such types". Our thesis is that the picture of dependent theory is the combination of the one for stable theories and the one for the theory of dense linear order or trees (and first we should try to understand the quite saturated case). As a measure of our progress, we give several applications considering some test questions; in particular we try to prove the generic pair conjecture and do it for measurable cardinals.

Annotated Content

§0 Introduction, pg.3-8

§1 Non-splitting construction, pg.9-16

[For κ-saturated M and N such that $M \prec N$ we try to analayze N over M by finding M_1, N_1 such that $M \prec M_1 \prec N_1, M \prec N \prec N_1$ and both $M_1/M, N_1/N$ are understable but in opposite ways. The first similar in some sense to the stable situation, the second to the situation for order.]

§2 The type decomposition theorem, pg.17-32

[For κ-saturated M and $\bar{d} \in \mathfrak{C}$ of length $< \theta^+$ we try to analyze the type $\text{tp}(\bar{d}, M)$ in two steps - pseudo stable and tree-like one. This is the main aim of the section (and a major part of the paper). It is done by looking at K_ℓ and $\text{mxK}^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$. A consequence which fulfilled to some extent the aim is the type decomposition theorem 2.3. As a second consequence we give a characterization of "M is exactly κ-saturated, $\kappa > \text{cf}(\kappa) > |T|$", see 2.2. In fact, we deal a little with singular exact saturation per se. "Unfortunately" there are independent (complete first order) T which has no model with singular exact saturation, see 2.20. But the existence of an indiscernible set for dependent T suffice (see 2.22 under instances of GCH) and has a neat characterization. Also, if p is a complete 1-type over a model M of T, M quite saturated has a spectrum in a suitable sense, see 2.27.]

§3 Existence of strict decomposition, pg.33-38

Date: February 4, 2010.

The author would like to thank the Israel Science Foundation for partial support of this research (Grant No. 242/03). Publication 900.

I would like to thank Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing.

[E.g. if M saturated of cardinality κ, a measurable cardinal, is analyzed. What we get is a better decomposition theorem (the strict one).]

§4 Consequences of strict decomposition, pg.39-46

[We start by sufficient conditions for a sequence being indiscernible. For a measurable cardinal κ $(> |T|)$ we confirm the structure half of the generic pair conjecture. Toward this if we have the consequences of §3 we can analyze generic pairs of models of T in κ. In a slightly simplified formulation this means: if $2^\kappa = \kappa^+, (\kappa = \kappa^{<\kappa} > |T|), M_\alpha$, a model of T of cardinality κ for $\alpha < \kappa^+$ is $\prec$-increasing continuous, $M = \cup\{M_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa^+\}$ is κ^+-saturated, then for a club E of κ^+ for all $\alpha < \beta$ belonging to $\{\delta \in E : \delta$ has cofinality $\kappa\}$ the pair (M_β, M_α) has the same isomorphism type. In fact for $\kappa_1 < \kappa_2$ we get $\mathbb{L}_{\infty,\kappa_1}(\tau_T)$-equivalence, so we have a derived first order theory. For our proof we show that an increasing (short) sequence of so called strict (κ, θ)-decompositions has a limit.]

0. Introduction

We first give a page of introductory remarks for non-logicians to clarify notions and to motivate working on dependent theories. The classical center of model theory is investigating elementary classes, i.e. we fix a vocabulary τ (i.e. a set of predicates and function symbols), for a τ-structure M let $\mathrm{Th}(M)$ be the set of first order sentences which M satisfies, T a complete first order theory T is $\mathrm{Th}(M)$ for some τ-model M. We fix T and $\tau = \tau_T$ and τ-models of T, i.e. τ-structurs M such that $T = \mathrm{Th}(M)$; fix other contents, see e.g. [**?**].

Let M, N denote such structurs and they are claled models. Let $\bar a, \bar b, \bar c, \bar d$ denote sequences of elements of such models and $\varphi(\bar x)$ or $\varphi(\bar x, \bar y)$ denote members of $\mathbb{L}(\tau)$, i.e. the set of first order formulas in this vocabulary but we allow $\bar x$ to be infinite.

Let $M \models \varphi[\bar a]$ say that the model M satisfies the formulas $\varphi(\bar x)$ under the substitution $\bar a \mapsto \bar a$ (so $\bar a, \bar x$ has the same length.

The right notion of sub-models in $\prec$, being elementary submodel where $M \prec N$ iff $M \subseteq N$ and for every $\varphi(\bar x) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau)$ and $\bar a \in {}^{\ell g(\bar x)}M$ we have $M \models \varphi[\bar a]$ iff $N \models \varphi[\bar b]$.

Recall that an ordinal is the isomorphism type of a well ordering and it is considered the set of smaller ordinals and an ordinal of the same power, a cardinal is infinite if not said otherwise $\aleph_\alpha$ is the α-th infinite ordinal and a the cardinality of a set is the minimal.

Now for transparency assume G.C.H., the generalized continuum hypothesis, i.e. $2^{\aleph_\alpha} = \aleph_{\alpha+1}$ for every ordinal α, and the successor λ^+ of a cardinal λ is $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$ when $\lambda = \aleph_\alpha$.

We say E is a closed subset of the cardinal γ when $E \subseteq \gamma^+$ and $\delta < \lambda^+ \wedge \delta = \sup(\delta \cap E) \Rightarrow \delta \in E$ and E is called unbounded when $(\forall \alpha < \gamma)(\exists \beta)(\alpha \le \beta \in E)$, "$E$ is a club of γ" and is shorthand for "E is a closed unbounded subset of γ".

For an ordinal α let $\mathrm{cf}(\alpha) = \min\{|C| : C$ an unbounded subset of $\alpha\} = \{\mathrm{otp}(C) : C$ a closed unbounded subset of $\alpha\}$; we say α is regular if $\alpha = \mathrm{cf}(\alpha)$ is infinite (hence is a cardinal), now if α is a limit ordinal(e.g. a cardinal) then $\mathrm{cf}(\alpha)$ is regular, and every λ^+ is regular.

A central notion is type; for $A \subseteq M$ and $\bar a$ a sequence from M let $\mathrm{tp}(\bar a, A, M)$ be the set $\{\varphi(\bar x, \bar b) : \bar\varphi(\bar x, \bar y) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau), \bar b$ a sequence from A and $M \models \varphi[\bar a, \bar b]\}$.

Let

$$\mathbf{S}^\alpha(A, M) = \{\mathrm{tp}(\bar a, A, N) : M \prec N, \bar a \text{ a sequence of length } \alpha \text{ from } N\}$$

$$\mathbf{S}^\alpha(M) = \mathbf{S}^\alpha)(M, M).$$

By this we can define another central notion. M is κ-saturated iff for every $A \subseteq M, |A| < \kappa$ and $p \in \mathbf{S}^1(A, M)$ some $a \in M$ realizes A in p which means $p = \mathrm{tp}(a, A, M)$. M is saturated when it is κ-saturated of cardinality κ. Let $\mathrm{EC}_\lambda(T)$ be the class of models of T of cardinality λ.

It is classically known that for $\lambda \ge |T|$, (as we are assuming $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$) there is a saturated member of $\mathrm{EC}_{\lambda^+}(T)$, it is unique up to isomorphism, and the union of an $\prec$-increasing chain of saturated members of $\mathrm{EC}_{\lambda^+}(T)$ of length λ^+ is a saturated member of $\mathrm{EC}_{\lambda^+}(T)$. On the background so far, see e.g. Chang-Keisler [CK73].

A major theme of the author's work is trying to find natural dividing lines (i.e. or property) in the family of first order complete T, in particular "inside definitions" by formulas and "outside definition" by properties of the class of its model; we have consequences for those with the property and for those without it.

A major such dividing line is "T is stable" which holds iff $(*)^1_T$ iff $(*)^2_T$ where

$(*)^1_T$ for some $\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y}) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_T)$ model M of T and $\bar{a}_n \in {}^{(\ell g(\bar{x}))}M, \bar{b}_n \in {}^{(\ell g(\bar{y}))}M$ for $n < \omega$ we have $n < m \Leftrightarrow M \models \varphi[\bar{a}_n, \bar{b}_m]$

$(*)^2_T$ for every $\lambda \geq |T|$ limit ordinal $\delta \leq \lambda^+$ of cofinality $> |T|$, the union of any $\prec$-increasing chain of saturated models of T of cardinailty λ^+ is saturated.

Another major dividing line is "T is superstable" which holds iff

$(*)^3_T$ like $(*)^2_T$ allowing any limit ordinal δ.

On this and the relevant history, see e.g. [Sh:c].

The property we deal with is "T is dependent" where its negation, "T is independent" or "T has the independence property" means

$(*)^4_T$ there are $\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y}) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_T)$, a model M of T and $\bar{a}_u \in {}^{(\ell g(\bar{x}))}M, \bar{b}_n \in {}^{(\ell g(\bar{y}))}M$ for $u \subseteq \omega, n < \omega$ such that $n \in u \Leftrightarrow M \models \varphi[\bar{a}_u, \bar{b}_n]$.

What is the motivation to investigate this dividing line? First, it has a nice, simple definition, parallel to the one for stable theories. Second, it is a wider class than that of the stable theories; for many the fact that whereas fields with stable first order complete theory are hard to come by (algebraically closed and separably closed) there are many important fields with dependent first order complete theory (the p-adics and many of power series). Third, there are some results on it indicating it is not unreasonable to hope there is a rich theory on it to be discovered.

On background on dependent theories, see [Sh:715], [Sh:783].

* * *

Let T be a fixed first order compelte theory. For simplicity we assume G.C.H., i.e. $2^\kappa = \kappa^+$ for every infinite cardinal and consider λ regular $> |T|^+$. Let $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$ be an $\prec$-increasing continuous sequence of models of T of cardinality λ with M being saturated where $M := \{M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+\}$ being saturated. Now M is unique (up to isomorphism, for each λ) and though $\bar{M}$ is not unique, for any two such sequences $\bar{M}', \bar{M}''$ there is a closed unbounded subset E of λ^+ and isomorphism f from $M' = \cup\{M'_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+\}$ onto $M'' = \cup\{M''_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ such that f maps M'_δ onto M''_δ for every $\delta \in E$.

So it is natural to ask ($\lambda > |T|$ and E varies on closed unbounded subsets of λ^+)

$\odot_1$ what [1] is $\mathbf{n}_\lambda(T) := \text{Min}_E|\{M_\delta/\cong : \delta \in E\}|$? where $M_\delta/\cong$ is the isomorphism type of M_δ. When is it one?

Now (see [Sh:868]):

---

[1] We can present the problem differently, about the existence of (variations of) (λ,κ)-limit models (so $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$ is no longer necesary, by forcing this is equivalent). Also instead of the function $\mathbf{n}$ getting the value λ^+ we can consider saying for some club no two relevant cases are isomorphic. This does not make a real difference but we find the present has more transparent presentation.

- $\odot_2$ $\mathbf{n}_\lambda(T) = 1$ iff T is superstable
- $\odot_3$ for countable $T, \mathbf{n}_\lambda(T) = 2$ iff T is strictly stable (i.e. T is stable, not superstable)
- $\odot_4$ given an ordinal γ for λ large enough $\mathbf{n}_\lambda(T) = |\gamma + 1|$ iff T is stable and $\kappa(T) = \aleph_\gamma$ (recalling that for a stable $T, \kappa(T)$ is cardinal $\le |T|^+$, so for countable T it is $\aleph_0$ or $\aleph_1$)
- $\odot_5$ if T is unstable, $\lambda = \aleph_\gamma$ then $\mathbf{n}_\lambda(T) \ge |\gamma + 1|$.

[Why? Because for some closed unbounded subset E of $\lambda^+, [\delta_1, \delta_2 \in E \wedge \text{ cf}(\delta_1) \ne \text{ cf}(\delta_2) \Rightarrow M_{\delta_1} \ncong M_{\delta_2}]$.]

Hence it is natural to replace $\mathbf{n}_\lambda(T)$ by

- $\odot_6$ let $\mathbf{n}_{\lambda,\kappa}(T) = \text{ Min}_E|\{M_\gamma / \cong : \delta \in E \text{ and cf}(\delta) = \kappa\}$ when $\lambda > \kappa = \text{ cf}(\kappa)$ (and $\lambda > |T|$).

Below we use $\mathbf{n}_{\lambda,\kappa}(T)$ only when $\lambda > |T| + \kappa \wedge \kappa = \text{ cf}(\kappa)$ and remember that for simplicity we are assuming G.C.H.

Now (see [Sh:868]):

- $\odot_7$ if T is stable then $\mathbf{n}_{\lambda,\kappa}(T) = 1$.

It is natural to ask whether this characterizes stable theory. The answer is no, in fact, by an example everyone knows (see [Sh:877, §1])

- $\odot_8$ $\mathbf{n}_{\lambda,\kappa}(T) = 1$ for $T = \text{ Th}(\mathbb{Q}, <)$, the theory of dense linear orders with neither first nor last element, when λ is regular so $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda} > \kappa = \text{ cf}(\kappa)$

During the proof we analyze $p \in \mathbf{S}(M_\alpha), M_\alpha$ saturated. So M_α is a linear order and p induces a cut (C_p^-, C_p^+) of M_α, i.e. $C_p^- = \{a \in M_\alpha : (a < x) \in p\}$ is an initial segment of M_α and its compliment, $\{a \in M_\alpha : (a < x) \notin p\}$ is an end segment. This gives a pair of cofinalities, $(\mu_p^-, \mu_p^+), \mu_p^-$ the cofinality of the linear order C_p^- and μ_p^+ the cofinality of the inverse of C_p^+.

Now

- $(*)_{8.1}$ if $\mu_p := \text{ min}\{\mu_p^-, \mu_p^+\} < \lambda$, then the type is determined by any set of cardinality μ_p unbounded in C_p^- if $\mu_p = \mu_p^-$ and unbounded from below in C_p^+ if $\mu_p = \mu_p^+$
- $(*)_{8.2}$ if $\mu_p = \lambda$, and we expand M_α by the (unary) relation C_p^1, we still get a saturated model.

Next considering $\odot_7 + \odot_8$ you may think that for every T we get one but ([Sh:877, 2.3(2)] implies directly that):

- $\odot_9$ $\mathbf{n}_{\lambda,\kappa}(T) = \lambda^+$ if T is Peano arithmetic

moreover, this holds for quite many theories T:

- $\odot_{10}$ $\mathbf{n}_{\lambda,\kappa}(T) = \lambda^+$ if T has the strong independence property (see [Sh:72], i.e. for some first order formula $\varphi(x,y), \langle \varphi(M,a) : a \in M\rangle$ is an independent sequence of subsets of M).

For me this rings a bell and strengthens a suspicion - maybe the dividing line is T independent/T dependent, indeed (by [Sh:877, §2])

$\odot_{11}$ $\mathbf{n}_{\lambda,\kappa}(T) = \lambda^+$ if T is independent, λ a successor cardinal.

We try to address the complement, the structure side. This calls for analyzing appropriate $\prec$-increasing continuous sequence $\bar{M} = \langle M_i : i \le \kappa \rangle$ of models of T of cardinality λ. Clearly in the relevant cases they increase fast enough and M_i is saturated for i non-limit. Now among such sequences, is it not reasonable to first deal with the case of length 2?

This leads to the generic pair conjecture which says that for $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda} > |T|$, we have T is independent iff $\mathbf{n}_{\lambda,2}(T) = \lambda^+$ where:

$\odot_{12}$ $\mathbf{n}_{\lambda,2}(T) := \text{Min}_E |\{(M_\alpha, M_\beta)/\cong : \alpha < \beta$ belongs to E and $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \lambda = \text{cf}(\beta)\}|$.

Note that in defining $\mathbf{n}_{\lambda,\kappa}(\mathbf{T}), \kappa \in \text{ Reg } \cap [\aleph_0, \lambda]$ we speak on models of T whereas here we deal with pairs of model. But in $\kappa \in \text{ Reg } \cap [\aleph_0, \lambda)$, we may deal with κ-tuples, this eems closed. Anyhow the numbers depend just on T (and λ, κ or 2) up to isomorphism there is one saturated model of T of cardinality λ^+.

This connects us to the long term goal of classifying first order theories by "good" dividing lines, ones in which we find outside properties (like here investigating $\mathbf{n}_{\lambda,\kappa}(T)$ or just $\mathbf{n}_{\lambda,\lambda}(T)$, trying to characterize it) with "inside" definitions (like being dependent), and developing an inside theory; here - looking at decomposition (in §1 of models, in §2 decomposition of types in §3,§4 strict decomposition of types). More fully for this we have to analyze types. In §1 we make a first attempt. We try to analyze M_β over M_α by trying to find a model N such that

$\boxplus_1$ $M_\alpha \prec N \prec M_\beta$

$\boxplus_2$ for every $\bar{a} \in {}^{\omega>}N$ for some $B_\alpha \in [M_\alpha]^{<\lambda}$ the type $\text{tp}(\bar{a}, M_\alpha, M_\beta)$ is definable over B_α in a weak sense, i.e. does not split over B_α, this means that if $n < \omega$ and $\bar{b}, \bar{c} \in {}^n(M_\alpha)$ realizes the same type over B_α then so does $\bar{a}\hat{\ }\bar{b}, \bar{a}\hat{\ }\bar{c}$ (this is parallel to $(*)_{8.1}$ from $\odot_8$)

$\boxplus_3$ $\text{tp}(M_\beta, N, M_\beta)$ is weakly orthogonal to every $q \in \mathbf{S}^{<\omega}(N)$ which does not split over some $B \in [N]^{<\lambda}$; the weakly orthogonal means that q has a unique extension in $\mathbf{S}^n(M_\beta)$ where $q \in \mathbf{S}^n(N)$.

In §2 we try to analyze a type rather than a pair of models, also we find it better to deal with θ-types, $\theta \ge |T|$, as in the analysis we add more variables. So for a κ-saturated model M and sequence $\bar{d}$ of length $< \theta^+$ we try to analyze $\text{tp}(\bar{d}, M, \mathfrak{C})$ in two steps. The first is to add $\bar{c}$ of length $< \theta^+$ such that

$\boxplus_4$ $\text{tp}(\bar{c}, M, \mathfrak{C})$ does not split over some $B \subseteq M \prec \mathfrak{C}$ of cardinality $< \kappa$.

This corresponds to the stable type ("unfortunately" but unavoidably depending on κ), so for the theory of dense linear orders it corresponds to types $p \in \mathbf{S}(M)$ with $\mu_p < \kappa$. True, they are not really definable, but non-splitting is a weak form of being definable. The second step is

$\boxplus_5$ $\text{tp}(\bar{d}, M + \bar{c}, \mathfrak{C})$ is tree like, i.e. if $A \subseteq M \prec \mathfrak{C}, \bar{c} \in {}^{\theta^+>}\mathfrak{C}, |A| < \kappa$ then for some $\bar{e} \in {}^{\theta^+>}M$ we have $\text{tp}(\bar{d}, \bar{c} + \bar{e}) \vdash \text{tp}(\bar{d}, A + c)$.

This property holds for $T = \text{Th}(\mathbb{Q}, <), p \in \mathbf{S}(M)$ when $\mu_p \ge \kappa!$, i.e. when both cofinalities are $\ge \kappa$. This is the decomposition theorem.

A consequence is some clarification of models of M of a dependent theory which are exactly κ-saturated for singular κ. We deal with this question to some extent per se.

In §3 we get a better decomposition - strict decomposition. But at present with a price, e.g. $\kappa = \|M\|$ is measurable. The main point appears in §4, the existence of limits of increasing sequences of strict decompositions.

From this we get the pair genericity conjecture, the structure side for the case of a measurable cardinal. The measurability assumption seems undesirable. Describing this to Udi Hrushovski he was more concerned about also having the non-structure side for independent T. Now at the time in [Sh:877] it was remarked that a similar proof should work for the strongly inaccessibles, but the author was not motivated enough to really look into it. Subsequently [Sh:906] complete it.

The order of the sections is by their conceptions, so there are some repetitions. In [Sh:950] and Kaplan-Shelah [KpSh:946] we continue this work.

We thank the referee and John Baldwin for much helpful criticism.

Context 0.1. 1) T is complete first order theory.
2) $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}_T$ is a monster for T, omitting T when no confusion arises. I.e. $\bar\kappa$ is a large enough cardinal, $\mathfrak{C}$ is a $\bar\kappa$-saturated model such that we deal only with models $M \prec \mathfrak{C}$, sets $A \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$ of cardinality $< \bar\kappa$ and sequences $\bar a, \bar b, \bar c, \bar d, \bar e$ from ${}^\alpha\mathfrak{C}$ for some $\alpha < \kappa$. So $\text{tp}(\bar c, A)$ means $\text{tp}(\bar c, A, \mathfrak{C})$.
3) We may not pedantically distinguish a model M and its universe, the cardinality $\|M\|$ of M is that of its universe.

Notation 0.2. 1) For $M \prec \mathfrak{C}$ and $\bar a \in {}^\alpha M$ let $M_{[\bar a]}$ be the expansion of M by every $R_{\varphi(\bar x, \bar a)} = \varphi(M, \bar a)$ where $\varphi(M, \bar a) := \{\bar b \in {}^{\ell g(\bar x)}M : \mathfrak{C} \models \varphi[\bar b, \bar a]\}$ for $\varphi(\bar x, \bar y) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_T)$ such that $\ell g(\bar y) = \alpha, \ell g(\bar x) < \omega$ or pedantically $\varphi(\bar x, \bar y \restriction u)$ for $\bar x, \bar y$ as above, $u \subseteq \alpha$ finite. We define $M_{[B]}$ similarly.
2) Writing $\varphi(\bar x, \bar y) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_T), \varphi$ is here always first order but $\bar x$ and $\bar y$ may be infinite, though sometimes are finite (said or clear from the context). Let $p(\bar x), q(\bar x), r(\bar x)$ denote types over some $A \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$, i.e. set of formulas of the form $\varphi(\bar x, \bar b), \bar b \in {}^{(\ell g(\bar b))}A$.
3) $\text{EC}_\lambda(T)$ is the class of models M of T (so $M \prec \mathfrak{C}$) of cardinality λ.
4) $A + \bar c$ is $A \cup$ Rang$(\bar c)$, etc.

Definition 0.3. 1) If $\bar a_t \in {}^\gamma\mathfrak{C}$ for $t \in I$ and $\mathcal{D}$ is a filter on I and $\bar x = \langle x_i : i < \gamma \rangle$ and $A \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$ then $\text{Av}(\langle \bar a_t : t \in I \rangle / \mathcal{D}, A) = \{\varphi((\bar x, \bar b) : \bar b \in {}^{\omega >}A$ and the set $\{t \in I : \mathfrak{C} \models \varphi[\bar a_t, \bar b]\}$ belongs to $\mathcal{D}\}$. Recall that if $\mathcal{D}$ is an ultrafilter on $\{\bar a_t : t \in I\} \subseteq {}^\alpha A$ we define $\text{Av}(\mathcal{D}, A)$ similarly and if I a linear order and $\mathcal{D}$ is the filter of co-bounded subsets of I we may omit it. Note that if T is dependent and $\langle \bar a_t : t \in I \rangle$ an indiscernible sequence or $\mathcal{D}$ is an ultrafilter the result $\in \mathbf{S}^\gamma(A)$.
2) If $p(\bar x), q(\bar y)$ are complete types over A we say $p(\bar x), q(\bar y)$ are weakly orthogonal when for every $\bar a_1, \bar a_2$ realizing $p(\bar x)$ and $\bar b_1, \bar b_2$ realizing $q(\bar y)$ we have $\text{tp}(\bar a_1 \hat{\ } \bar b_1, A) = \text{tp}(\bar a_2 \hat{\ } \bar b_2, A)$.
3) For a linear order $I, \langle \bar a_s : s \in I \rangle$ is an indiscernible sequence over B when $\ell g(\bar a_s)$ is constant and if $s_0 <_I \ldots <_I s_{n-1}$ an $t_0 <_I \ldots <_I t_{n-1}$ then the sequences $\bar a_{s_0} \hat{\ } \ldots \hat{\ } \bar a_{s_{n-1}}$ and $\bar a_{t_0} \hat{\ } \ldots \hat{\ } \bar a_{t_{n-1}}$ realize the same type over B.

Recall also

Claim 0.4. *If T is dependent then for any $\varphi = \varphi(\bar x, \bar y, \bar z) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_T)$ there is $n = n_\varphi < \omega$ (depending on T) such that*

- (a) *for no* $\bar{c} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{z})}\mathfrak{C}, \bar{b}_i \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{y})}\mathfrak{C}$ *is the sequence* $\langle \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}_i, \bar{c}) : i < n)$ *independent, i.e. every non-trivial Boolean combination of the sets* $\varphi(M, \bar{b}_i, \bar{c}) = \{\bar{a} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{x})}M : M \models \varphi[\bar{a}, \bar{b}_i, \bar{c}]\}$ *is non-empty*
- (b) *if* $\langle \bar{b}_i : i < n \rangle$ *is an indiscernible sequence over* $C, \ell g(\bar{b}_i) = \ell g(\bar{y}), \bar{c} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{z})}C$ *(all in* $\mathfrak{C}$*) then for no* $\bar{a} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{a})}M$ *do we have* $\mathfrak{C} \models \varphi[\bar{a}, \bar{b}_i, \bar{c}]^{\text{if}(\ell \text{ even})}$ *for* $\ell < n$
- (c) *also there is a finite* $\Delta_\varphi \subseteq \mathbb{L}(\tau_T)$ *such that in clause (b) it is enough to demand that* $\langle \bar{b}_i : i < n \rangle$ *is a* Δ*-indiscernible sequence.*

1. Non-splitting constructions

On such constructions including $\mathbf{F}^{\rm nsp}_\kappa$ see [Sh:c, ChIV,§1,§3] but $\mathbf{F}^{\rm nsp}$ here is $\mathbf{F}^p$ there; and see [Sh:715, 4.23-4.26] however this section is self-contained.

We try here to analyze κ-saturated $M \prec N$, e.g. by finding M_1, M_2 such that $M \prec M_1 \prec M_2, N \prec M_2$ where M_1 is $\mathbf{F}^{\rm nsp}_\kappa$-constructible over M, see below and ${\rm tp}(M_2, M_1)$ is weakly orthogonal to any type over M_1 realized in some $\mathbf{F}^{\rm nsp}_\kappa$-construction over it. We first recall things on splitting.

Definition/Claim 1.1. 0) We say $p(\bar x)$ does not split over A when: if $\varphi(\bar x, \bar b), \neg\varphi(\bar x, \bar c) \in p(\bar x)$ then ${\rm tp}(\bar b, A) \neq {\rm tp}(\bar c, A)$.
1) If $\circledast_{A,B,C}$ below holds and $p(\bar x) \in \mathbf{S}^m(B)$ does not split over A, then there is one and only one $q(\bar x) \in \mathbf{S}^m(C)$ extending $p(\bar x)$ and not splitting over A (also called the non-splitting extension of $p(\bar x)$ over C), where:

$\circledast_{A,B,C}$ (a) $A \subseteq B \subseteq C$
(b) for every $\bar c \in {}^{\omega>}C$ there is $\bar b \in {}^{\ell g(\bar c)}B$ realizing ${\rm tp}(\bar c, A)$.

2) Let I be a linear order. If ${\rm tp}(\bar a_t, B \cup \bigcup\{\bar a_s : s <_I t\})$ does not split over B and increases with t then $\langle \bar a_t : t \in I\rangle$ is an indiscernible sequence over B.
3) If ${\rm tp}(\bar a, B)$ does not split over A, the sequence $\langle \bar b_t : t \in I\rangle$ is an indiscernible sequence over A (or just over some $A' \subseteq A$) and $\bar b_t \subseteq B$ for $t \in I$ then $\langle \bar b_t : t \in I\rangle$ is an indiscernible sequence over $A \cup \bar a$.
4) If $A \subseteq B$ then the number of $p \in \mathbf{S}^\theta(B)$ which does not split over A is $\leq 2^{2^{|A|+|T|+\theta}}$, moreover if T is dependent the number is $\leq 2^{|A|+|T|+\theta}$.

Proof. 1) By [Sh:3] or see [Sh:715] or see [Sh:300a, 1.10] for uniqueness.
2) By [Sh:c, I] or [Sh:300, I] or [Sh:300a, 3.2].
3) By the definitions.
4) The first conclusion is easy and see [Sh:3] or [Sh:300a, §1], the second holds by [Sh:783, 5.26]. $\square_{1.1}$

Claim 1.2. *If $p(\bar x)$ is an α-type over $B \subseteq A$ then we can find $q(\bar x) \in \mathbf{S}^\alpha(A)$ extending $p(\bar x)$ such that for some $C \subseteq A$ of cardinality $\leq |T|$ the type $q(\bar x)$ does not split over $B \cup C$.*

Proof. [Sh:c, III,7.5,pg.140] or see [Sh:715, 4.24]. $\square_{1.2}$

As in [Sh:c, IV].

Definition 1.3. 1) $\mathcal{A}$ is $\mathbf{F}^{\rm nsp}_\kappa$-construction when:

(a) $\mathcal{A} = (A, \bar a, \bar B, \bar A, \alpha) = (A^{\mathcal{A}}, \bar a^{\mathcal{A}}, \bar B^{\mathcal{A}}, \bar A^{\mathcal{A}}, \alpha^{\mathcal{A}})$
(b) $\bar a = \langle a_\beta : \beta < \alpha\rangle = \langle a^{\mathcal{A}}_\beta : \beta < \alpha\rangle$
(c) $\bar B = \langle B_\beta : \beta < \alpha\rangle = \langle B^{\mathcal{A}}_\beta : \beta < \alpha\rangle$
(d) $\bar A = \langle A_\beta : \beta \leq \alpha\rangle = \langle A^{\mathcal{A}}_\beta : \beta \leq \alpha\rangle$
(e) $A_\beta = A \cup \{a_\gamma : \gamma < \beta\}$
(f) $B_\beta \subseteq A_\beta$ and $|B_\beta| < \kappa$
(g) ${\rm tp}(a_\beta, A_\beta)$ does not split over B_β.

2) We let $\ell g(\mathcal{A}) = \alpha^{\mathcal{A}}$ and writing $\mathcal{A}$ we may omit $\bar{A}^{\mathcal{A}}, \alpha^{\mathcal{A}}$ as they are determined by the others so may write $\mathcal{A} = (A, \bar{a}, \bar{B})$ or $\mathcal{A} = (A, \langle (a_\beta, B_\beta) : \beta < \alpha \rangle)$. We may replace a_β by a finite sequence $\bar{a}_\beta$ with no real change.
3) We say the $\mathbf{F}^{\rm nsp}_\kappa$-construction $\mathcal{A}$ is μ-full when $\mathrm{cf}(\ell g(\mathcal{A})) \geq \kappa$ and if $q \in \mathbf{S}(A^{\mathcal{A}}_{\ell g(\mathcal{A})})$ does not split over B where $B \subseteq A^{\mathcal{A}}_{\ell g(\mathcal{A})}$ has cardinality $< \kappa$, then $\{\beta < \ell g(\mathcal{A}) : a_\beta$ realizes $p \restriction A^{\mathcal{A}}_\beta$ and $B \subseteq A^{\mathcal{A}}_\beta\}$ is unbounded in $\alpha^{\mathcal{A}}$ and has order type divisible by μ.
4) We say C is $\mathbf{F}^{\rm nsp}_\kappa$-constructible over A when there is an $\mathbf{F}^{\rm nsp}_\kappa$-construction $\mathcal{A}$ such that $A = A^{\mathcal{A}} = A^{\mathcal{A}}_0$ and $C = A^{\mathcal{A}}_{\ell g(\mathcal{A})}$.

Definition 1.4. 1) Let $A \leq_\kappa C$ mean that C is $\mathbf{F}^{\rm nsp}_\kappa$-constructible over A.
2) We say that (A, A^+) is κ-reduced when: if $A \leq_\kappa C$ and $\bar{c} \in {}^{\kappa>}(A^+)$ then $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}, A)$ has a unique extension to a complete type over C.
3) We say the (M, N) is κ-nice when

- (a) (M, N) is κ-reduced and $M \prec N$
- (b) M is κ-saturated
- (c) N is κ-saturated
- (d) if $M \leq_\kappa M^+$ then $M_{[N]} \prec M^+_{[N]}$, see below.

3A) Recall $M_{[B]}$ is M expanded by $R_{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a})} = \{\bar{b} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{x})}M : \mathfrak{C} \models \varphi[\bar{b}, \bar{a}]\}$ for $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_T), \bar{a} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{y})}N$ and recall $\mathrm{Th}(M_{[B]})$ is dependent by [Sh:783, §1].
4) We say that (M, A) is pseudo κ-reduced when: if $\bar{c} \in {}^{\omega>}A, \|M_1\| < \kappa, M_1 \subseteq M, q(\bar{x}) \in \mathbf{S}^{<\omega}(M)$ is finitely satisfiable in M_1 then $q(\bar{x})$, $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}, M)$ are weakly orthogonal.

Observation 1.5. For κ regular:
1) $\leq_\kappa$ is a partial order.
2) If $\langle A_i : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ is increasing continuous and $i < \alpha \Rightarrow A_i \leq_\kappa A_{i+1}$ then $A_0 \leq_\kappa A_\alpha$.
3) In Definition 1.4(2) it is enough to consider $\bar{c} \in {}^{\omega>}(C \backslash A)$.
4) If $A \leq_\kappa B$ and $c \in {}^{\kappa>}B$ then [2] $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}, A)$ does not split over some $A' \subseteq A$ of cardinality $< \kappa$.
5) If $A \subseteq B, |A| < \kappa$ and $\bar{a} \in {}^{\kappa>}\mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{a}, B)$ is finitely satisfiable in A then it does not split over A.
6) If $A \subseteq B, \bar{c} \in {}^{\kappa>}\mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}, B)$ does not split over A and $i < \ell g(\bar{c})$ then $\mathrm{tp}(c_i, B \cup \{c_j : j < i\})$ does not split over $A \cup \{c_j : j < i\}$.
7) If $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_k, B + \bar{c}_0 + \ldots + \bar{c}_{k-1})$ does not split over $A \subseteq B$ for $k \leq n$ then $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_0 \hat{} \ldots \hat{} \bar{c}_{n-1}, B)$ does not split over A.
8) If $A \subseteq A_1 \subseteq B_1 \subseteq B$ and $\mathrm{Rang}(\bar{c}_1) \subseteq \mathrm{Rang}(\bar{c})$ and $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}, B)$ does not split over A then $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_1, B_1)$ does not split over A_1.
9) If the pair (M, C) is κ-reduced then (M, C) is pseudo κ-reduced.

Proof. Easy. $\square_{1.5}$

Claim 1.6. *[T is dependent and $\kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > |T|$].*
1) For every A there is a κ-saturated C such that $A \leq_\kappa C$ and $|C| \leq (|A| + |T|)^{<\kappa}$.
2) Similarly "μ-full κ-saturated", for $\mu = \mathrm{cf}(\mu) \geq \kappa$ (clearer if $|C| \leq (|A| + |T|)^{<\kappa} + 2^{2^\kappa}$).

---

[2] we could have chosen this as the definition. This changes the places we really need "κ regular".

Proof. 1) By 1.2 + 1.5(2).
2) Similarly (by 1.1(4)). $\square_{1.6}$

Now we arrive to the first result given a decomposition. The type $\text{tp}(A^+, A)$ is decomposed in Theorem 1.7 by finding M such that $A \le_\kappa M$, (so the complete types over A realized in M are somewhat definable) and (M, A^+) is κ-reduced, so the type $\text{tp}(A^+, M)$ is weakly orthogonal to types in $\mathscr{S}^{<\omega}(M)$ not splitting over subsets of M of cardinality $< \kappa$.

Theorem 1.7. *The density of reduced pairs Theorem [T dependent]*

For any $A \subseteq A^+$ and $\kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa) > |T|$ and λ satisfying[3] $\theta < \kappa \Rightarrow \lambda = \lambda^\theta \ge |A^+|$ *we can find M such that*

- (A) *M is a model of cardinality λ such that $A \le_\kappa M$ and (M, A^+) is κ-reduced*
- (B) *(M, N) is κ-reduced and even κ-nice and $A^+ \subseteq N$.*

Proof. Clause (A): We choose $M_i, B_i, j_i, \bar{c}_i$ by induction on $i \le \lambda^+$ such that

☒ (a) M_i is $\prec$-increasing continuous, M_i of cardinality $\lambda + |i|$
(b) $j_i \le i, B_i \prec M_i, \|B_i\| < \kappa$
(c) M_0 is $\mathbf{F}^{\text{nsp}}_\kappa$-constructible over A
(d) M_{i+1} is $\mathbf{F}^{\text{nsp}}_\kappa$-constructible over M_i and M_{i+1} is κ-saturated
(e) $\bar{c}_i \in {}^{\omega>}(M_{i+1})$ and $B_i \subseteq M_i$ has cardinality $< \kappa$
(f) $\text{tp}(\bar{c}_i, M_i)$ does not split over B_i
(g) if $\text{cf}(i) \ge \kappa$ and clause (α) below holds then clause (β) where
Clause (α): There are $j < i, m < \omega, B \subseteq M_j$ of cardinality $< \kappa$ and $p(\bar{x}) \in \mathbf{S}^m(M_i)$ which does not split over B and $p(\bar{x})$ has ≥ 2 extensions in $\mathbf{S}^m(M_i \cup A^+)$.
Clause (β): There are $m_i < \omega, j = j_i < i, k = k_i < \omega, B = B_i \subseteq M_j, |B| < \kappa$ and $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = \varphi_i(\bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_i) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_T)$ with $\bar{x}, \bar{y}$ finite and $\bar{b} = \bar{b}_i \in {}^{(\ell g(\bar{y}))}(M_j \cup A^+)$ and $\varepsilon_0 < \ldots < \varepsilon_{k-1}$ from the interval (j_i, i) such that $\text{tp}(\bar{c}_i, M_i)$ does not split over B, $\text{tp}(\bar{c}_{\varepsilon_\ell}, M_{\varepsilon_\ell}) = \text{tp}(\bar{c}_i, M_{\varepsilon_\ell})$ and $\mathfrak{C} \models \varphi[\bar{c}_{\varepsilon_\ell}, \bar{b}]^{\text{if}(\ell \text{ even})}$ and k is maximal for the given $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}), \bar{b}, j_i$ (see ⊛ below; note that we are allowed to change $\text{tp}(\bar{c}_i, M_i)$) and $M_\zeta, \bar{c}_\zeta$ for $\zeta < i$ and $\mathfrak{C} \models \varphi[\bar{c}_i, \bar{b}]^{\text{if}(k \text{ is even})}$; k is well defined as T is dependent, see ⊛ below).

So in stage i we first choose M_i: if $i = 0$ by clause (c), if i is a limit ordinal we choose M_i as $\cup\{M_j : j < i\}$ and if $i = j + 1$ (so $\bar{c}_j$ has already been defined) then choose M_i such that $M_j \cup \bar{c}_j \le_\kappa M_{j+1}$ and $M_i = M_{j+1}$ is κ-saturated of cardinality λ (and λ-full if you like), possible by Claim 1.6(1). Note that $M_j \le_\kappa M_j \cup \bar{c}_j$ by clauses (c) + (f) hence $M_j \le_\kappa M_{j+1}$ recalling 1.5(2).

Note

⊛ there is $n = n_{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})}$ depending on $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ and T only such that in subclause (β) we have $\varphi_i(\bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_i) = \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \Rightarrow k_i \le n$.

---

[3] no real harm if we replace "$\theta < \lambda \Rightarrow \lambda = \lambda^\theta \ge |A^+|$" by $\theta < \kappa \Rightarrow \lambda = \lambda^\theta + 2^{2^{\theta + |T|}} \ge |A^+|$ and then we can use only the first version of 1.1(4)

[Why? As in subclause (β) by 1.1(2) the sequence $\langle \bar c_{\varepsilon_\ell} : \ell < k\rangle$ is an indiscernible sequence, so by T being dependent we are done by 0.4.]

Second, we can choose $(m_i, j_i, B_i, \varphi_i, \mathrm{tp}(\bar c_i, M_i))$ as required in clause (g). If $\mathrm{cf}(i) < \kappa$ or the antecedent of clause (g), i.e. $(g)(\alpha)$ fails then trivially yes (choose e.g. $\bar c_i$ as the empty sequence). Otherwise let $j < i, B \subseteq M_j$ be of cardinality $< \kappa, m < \omega$ and $p(\bar x) \in \mathbf{S}^m(M_i)$ which does not split over B and $p(\bar x)$ which has extensions $p_0(\bar x) \neq p_1(\bar x)$ in $\mathbf{S}^m(M_i \cup C)$ with $p_0 \restriction (M_i \cup A^+) \neq p_1 \restriction (M_i \cup A^+)$ but $p_0 \restriction M_i = p = p_1 \restriction M_i$ does not split over B.

Hence for some $\bar b \in {}^{\omega>}(M_i \cup A^+)$ and $\varphi = \varphi(\bar x, \bar y) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_T)$ we have $\varphi(\bar x, \bar b) \in p_1(\bar x), \neg\varphi(\bar x, \bar b) \in p_0(\bar x)$; as i is a limit ordinal without loss of generality $\bar b \in {}^{\omega}(M_j \cup A^+)$. We now try to choose $\varepsilon_\ell \in (j, i)$ by induction on $\ell \leq n_{\varphi(\bar x, \bar y)}$ such that:

$\odot$ (a) $\bar c_{\varepsilon_\ell}$ realizes $p(\bar x) \restriction M_{\varepsilon_\ell}$

(b) $\mathfrak{C} \models \varphi[\bar c_{\varepsilon_\ell}, \bar b]^{\mathrm{if}(\ell \text{ is even})}$

(c) ε_ℓ is minimal under (a)-(b).

So by $\circledast$ for some $k \leq n_{\varphi(\bar x, \bar y)}$ we have: ε_ℓ is well defined iff $\ell < k$. At last we choose:

$(*)$ (a) $B_i = B$

(b) $\varphi_i = \varphi$

(c) $j_i = \varepsilon_0$

(d) $k_i = k$

(e) $\bar c_i$ realizes $p_1(\bar x)$ if k is even and realizes $p_0(\bar x)$ if k is odd.

Case 1: Subclause (α) of clause (g) hold for $i = \lambda^+$.

Let B, j exemplify it, then subclause (α) of (g) holds for every $i \in (j, \lambda^+)$ so $B \subseteq M_i$. Hence subclause (β) of clause (g) holds for every $i \in (j, \lambda^+)$ of cofinality $\geq \kappa$ hence there are $\varphi_i(\bar x_i, \bar y_i), \bar b_i$ and $k_i < \omega$ and $\varepsilon_0(i) < \ldots < \varepsilon_{k_i - 1}(i) < i$ as in subclause (β) and by Fodor's lemma for some $m_* < \omega, j < \lambda^+, B, \varphi(\bar x, \bar b), k_*, \langle \varepsilon_i : i < k^*\rangle$ and a stationary subset S of $\{\delta < \lambda^+ \colon \mathrm{cf}(\delta) \geq \kappa\}$ we have $\delta \in S \Rightarrow j_\delta = j \wedge B_\delta = B \wedge \ell g(\bar c_\delta) = m_* \wedge \varphi_\delta(\bar x, \bar b_\delta) = \varphi(\bar x, \bar b) \wedge k_\delta = k_* \wedge \bigwedge\limits_{\ell < k_*} \varepsilon_\ell(\delta) = \varepsilon_\ell$. Also without loss of generality by 1.1(4) we have $\delta \in S \Rightarrow \mathrm{tp}(\bar c_\delta, M_{\min(S)}) = \mathrm{tp}(\bar c_{\min(S)}, M_{\min(S)})$ recalling that the number of such types is $\leq 2^{|B| + |T|}$. Choose $\delta(0) < \delta(1)$ from S so both has cofinality $\geq \kappa$ and $B_{\delta(0)} = B_{\delta(1)}$, $\mathrm{tp}(\bar c_{\delta(0)}, M_{\delta(0)}) \subseteq \mathrm{tp}(\bar c_{\delta(1)}, M_{\delta(1)})$ by 0.3(1) and $\bar b_{\delta(1)} = \bar b_{\delta(0)}$ and $\varepsilon_i(\delta(0)) = \varepsilon_i(\delta(1))$ for $i < k*$. But we could have chosen $\bar c'_{\delta(1)}$ realizing $\mathrm{tp}(\bar c_{\delta(0)}, M_{\delta(0)}) \cup \{\varphi_{\delta(0)}(\bar x, \bar b_{\delta(0)})^{\mathrm{if}(k_* + 1 \text{ is even})}\}$ and $k'_{\delta(1)} = k_* + 1$ and $\varepsilon'_{k_*}(\delta(1)) = \delta(0)$, contradiction to the maximality of k in subclause (β).

Case 2: Not Case 1.

Then for a club of $i < \lambda^+$ if $\mathrm{cf}(i) \geq \kappa$ then subclause (α) of clause (g) fails for i hence M_i exemplifies that we have gotten the desired conclusion in (A) of 1.7.

Clause (B): For $i < \lambda^+$ we choose $M_i, M_i^+, B_i, j_i, \bar c_i$ such that

$\boxtimes'$ clauses (a),(c),(d) of $\boxtimes$ and

(h) $\langle M_j^+ : j \leq i\rangle$ is $\prec$-increasing continuous and $C \subseteq M_0^+$

- (i) $M_i \prec M_i^+$ and M_i^+ has cardinality λ and if i is non-limit then M_i, M_i^+ are κ-saturated
- (j) if $\mathrm{cf}(i) \geq \kappa$ and there are $j_i < i, B \prec M_{j_i}$ of cardinality $< \kappa$ and $p \in \mathbf{S}^n(M_i)$ which does not split over B and has ≥ 2 extensions in $\mathbf{S}^m(M_j^+)$ then clause $\boxtimes(g)(\beta)$ above holds (with $\bar{b} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{y})}(M_j^+)$).

The rest of the proof is similar to that of clause (A). Alternatively, we choose M_i, M_i^+ by induction on $i \leq \kappa$ such that clauses (a),(c),(d) of $\boxtimes$ and (h),(i) of $\boxtimes'$ and

- (k) if $i = j+1$ then (M_{i+1}, M_j^+) is κ-reduced.

Then (M_κ, M_κ^+) are as required in $(M, 0)$. $\square_{1.7}$

* * *

Hypothesis 1.8. 1) T is dependent.
2) κ regular $> |T|$.

Definition 1.9. 1) $\mathbf{S}^{\mathrm{nsp}}_{<\kappa}(A) = \{p \in \mathbf{S}(A) : p$ does not split over some $B \subseteq A$ of cardinality $< \kappa\}$.
2) $\mathbf{S}^{\mathrm{nsp},\alpha}_{<\kappa}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{S}^\alpha(A)$ and $\mathbf{S}^{\mathrm{nsp},<\alpha}_{<\kappa}(A) \subseteq \bigcup\limits_{\beta<\alpha} \mathbf{S}^\beta(A)$ are defined similarly.
3) $\mathbf{S}^{\mathrm{nsp}}_{\geq\kappa}(A) = \{p \in \mathbf{S}(A) : p$ is weakly orthogonal to r for every $r \in \mathbf{S}^{\mathrm{nsp}}_{<\kappa}(A)\}$.
4) $\mathbf{S}^{\mathrm{nsp},\alpha}_{\geq\kappa}(A), \mathbf{S}^{\mathrm{nsp},<\alpha}_{\geq\kappa}(A)$ are defined similarly.

Observation 1.10. If $\kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > |T|$, the model M is κ-saturated, $p \in \mathbf{S}^m(M)$, then we can find N, q such that:

$\circledast^1_N$
- (a) $\|N\| = \|M\|^{<\kappa}$
- (b) $q \in \mathbf{S}^m(N)$ extends p
- (c) N is $\mathbf{F}^{\mathrm{nsp}}_{<\kappa}$-constructible over M

$\circledast^2_{N,q,\kappa}$
- (a) N is κ-saturated and $q \in \mathbf{S}^m(N)$
- (b) if $r \in \mathbf{S}^{\mathrm{nsp},<\omega}_{<\kappa}(N)$ then r, q are weakly orthogonal, i.e. $q \in \mathbf{S}^{\mathrm{nsp},m}_{\geq\kappa}(N)$.

Proof. Let $\bar{c}$ realize $p(\bar{x})$ and let $C = \mathrm{Rang}(\bar{c})$, now we apply clause (A) of Theorem 1.7. $\square_{1.10}$

Theorem 1.11. *The tree-like type Theorem Assume $q(\bar{x}) \in \mathbf{S}^{\mathrm{nsp},\alpha}_{\geq\kappa}(N)$ and N is κ-saturated and $\kappa > \theta = |T| + |\alpha|$ and let $\bar{z} = \langle z_\alpha : \alpha < \theta\rangle$. Then we can find a sequence $\bar{\psi} = \langle \psi_{\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y})}(\bar{x},\bar{z}) : \varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y}) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_T)\rangle$ of formulas such that for every $A \subseteq M$ of cardinality $< \kappa$ there is $\bar{c} \in {}^\theta M$ such that: $\{\psi_{\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y})}(\bar{x},\bar{c}) : \varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y}) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_T)\} \subseteq q{\restriction}\mathrm{Rang}(\bar{c}) \subseteq q$ and for each $\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y}) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_T)$ we have $\psi_{\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y})}(\bar{x},\bar{c}) \vdash \{\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{b}) : \bar{b} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{y})}A$ and $\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{b}) \in q\}$.*

Proof. This follows from claims 1.12, below 1.13 below. $\square_{1.11}$

Claim 1.12. *1) Assume that $\circledast^2_{N,q,\kappa}$ from the claim 1.10 holds, which means N is κ-saturated, $q \in \mathbf{S}^{\mathrm{nsp},m}_{\geq\kappa}(N)$ and let $m = 1$ for notational simplicity. Then*

$\circledast^3_{N,q,\kappa}$ *if $M \prec N$ has cardinality $< \kappa$ and $\varphi(x,y)$ is a formula with parameters from N, then for some $\psi(x,\bar{d}) = \psi_{\varphi(x,y),M}(x,\bar{d}_{\varphi(x,y),M}) \in q$ and $\eta \in {}^M 2$ we have $\psi(x,\bar{d}) \vdash p^{M,\eta}_{\varphi(x,y)}$ where*

$p^{M,\eta}_{\varphi(x,y)} = \{\varphi(x,b)^{\eta(b)} : b \in M\}$ *hence it necessarily is included in q.*

2) Part (1) works also for $q \in \mathbf{S}^{m(1)}(N)$ and $\varphi = \varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y})$ where $\ell g(\bar{x}) = m, \ell g(\bar{y}) < \omega$.

Proof. 1) First note that

$(*)_1$ if D is an ultrafilter on M then $q(x)$ is weakly orthogonal to $r_D = \text{Av}(D,N)$.

[Why? As r_D does not split over M, by 1.5(5).]

Second, note that

$(*)_2$ the following type cannot be finitely satisfiable in M:

$$\begin{aligned} r^*(y) = \quad & \{(\exists x_1)(\psi(x_1,\bar{d}) \wedge \varphi(x_1,y)) : \psi(x,\bar{d}) \in q\} \cup \\ & \{(\exists x_2)(\psi(x_2,\bar{d}) \wedge \neg\varphi(x_2,y)) : \psi(x,\bar{d}) \in q\}. \end{aligned}$$

[Why? Otherwise for some ultrafilter D on M we have $\vartheta(y) \in r^*(y) \Rightarrow \vartheta(M) \in D$. Let $b \in \mathfrak{C}$ realize $\text{Av}(D,N)$ so as $q(\bar{x})$ is closed under conjunction, $q(x) \cup \{\varphi(x,b)\}$ and $q(x) \cup \{\neg\varphi(x,b)\}$ are finitely satisfiable in $\mathfrak{C}$, and we get a contradiction to $(*)_1$.]

$(*)_3$ there is $\psi(x,\bar{d}) \in q$ such that $\{(\exists x_1)(\psi(x_1,\bar{d}) \wedge \varphi(x_1,y)), (\exists x_2)(\psi(x_2,\bar{d}) \wedge \neg\varphi(x_2,y))\}$ is satisfied by no $b \in M$.

[Why? By the monotonicity in $\psi(x,\bar{d})$ and q being closed under conjunctions this follows from $(*)_2$.]

$(*)_4$ let $\psi_{\varphi(x,y),M}(x,\bar{d}_{\varphi(x,y),M}) = \psi(x,\bar{d})$, from $(*)_3$

$(*)_5$ for every $b \in M$ we have $N \models (\forall x)(\psi(x,\bar{d}) \rightarrow \varphi(x,b))$ or $N \models (\forall x)(\psi(x,\bar{d}) \rightarrow \neg\varphi(x,\bar{b}))$.

[Why? By Logic this follows by $(*)_3$.]

$(*)_6$ there is $\eta \in {}^M 2$ such that for every $b \in M$ we have $\models (\exists x)(\psi(x,\bar{d}) \wedge \varphi(x,b))$ iff $\models \neg(\exists x)(\psi(x,y)) \wedge \neg\varphi(x,b)$ iff $\eta(b) = 1$.

[Why? By $(*)_5 + (*)_3$.]

So we are done.

2) Similarly. $\square_{1.12}$

Claim 1.13. *1) In the previous claim 1.12, if* $\text{cf}(\kappa) > |T|$ *then ψ does not depend on M though $\bar{d}$ in general does, i.e. for $\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y})$ without loss of generality $\psi_\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{d}) = \psi_{\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y})}(x,\bar{d}_{\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y}),N_1})$.*

2) Assume $\circledast^2_{N,q,\kappa}$ from claim 1.10, i.e. N is κ-saturated and $q \in \mathbf{S}^{\text{nsp},m}(N)$. Then the following partial order is κ-directed

(a) elements: $q \restriction B$ for $B \subseteq N$ of cardinality[4] $\leq |T|$

(b) order: $p_1 \leq p_2$ if $p_2 \vdash p_1$.

---

[4] from some form of strongly dependent we should be able to get "essentially finite"

Proof. 1) As if $N_1 \prec N_2 \prec N, \|N_\ell\| < \kappa$ and then $\psi_{\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y}),N_2}(x, \bar{d}_{\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y}),N_2})$ can serve as $\psi_{\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{y}),N_1}(\bar{x}, \bar{d}_{\varphi(\bar{x},q),N_2})$.
2) Easy. $\square_{1.13}$

As a conclusion we can now show that a key fact in [Sh:868] for the theory $T =$ Th$(\mathbb{Q}, <)$ has a parallel for every dependent T.

Conclusion 1.14. The Saturated Expansion Conclusion Assume

- (a) N is κ-saturated
- (b) $|A| < \kappa$
- (c) if $\bar{a} \in A$ then $q_{\bar{a}} =$ tp$(\bar{a}, N) \in \mathbf{S}^{\text{nsp},<\omega}_{\geq\kappa}(N)$, see Definition 1.9(3)
- (d) $N_{[A]}$ has elimination of quantifiers.

Then $N_{[A]}$ is κ-saturated.

Remark 1.15. 1) Recall $N_{[A]}$ is N expanded by $R_{\varphi(\bar{x},\bar{b})} = \{\bar{a} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{x})}N : \mathfrak{C} \models \varphi[\bar{a}, \bar{b}]\}$ for $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b})$ a formula with parameters from A, see [Sh:783, §1].
2) We can omit assumption (d) in 1.14, but then get κ-saturated only for quantifier free types.

Proof. Without loss of generality κ is regular (as it is enough to prove λ^+-saturation for every $\lambda \in [|A|, \kappa]$. Let $M \prec N$ be such that $A \subseteq M$ and $\|M\| < \kappa$ and assume $p = p(\bar{y}) \in \mathbf{S}^m(M_{[A]})$ and we shall prove that some $\bar{c} \in {}^m N$ realizes $p(\bar{y})$. Actually without loss of generality $M_{[A]} \prec N_{[A]}$ and by assumption (d) equivalently $p(\bar{y}) \in \mathbf{S}^m(M \cup A) = \mathbf{S}^m(M \cup A, \mathfrak{C})$ is finitely satisfiable in M. Let $\bar{c} = \langle c_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$ list A so $\alpha^* < \kappa$ and for $u \subseteq \alpha^*$ let $\bar{c}_u = \langle c_\alpha : \alpha \in u \rangle, \bar{x}_u = \langle x_\alpha : \alpha \in u \rangle$.

Next note that by claim 1.13(1) and 1.12(2) (here clause (c) of the assumption is used) applied to tp$(\bar{c}_u, N)$ noting $\bar{y}$ of length m is fixed, we have:

- $(*)_1$ for every finite $u \subseteq \alpha^*$ and formula $\varphi = \varphi(\bar{x}_u, \bar{y}, \bar{z}) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_T)$ there are $\psi_{\varphi(\bar{x}_u,\bar{y},\bar{z})}(\bar{x}, \bar{d}_{\varphi(\bar{x}_u,\bar{y},\bar{z}),M}) \in$ tp$(\langle c_\alpha : \alpha \in u \rangle, N)$ so $\bar{d}_{\varphi(\bar{x}_u,\bar{y},\bar{z}),M} \in {}^{\omega>}N$ and η a function from ${}^{\ell g(\bar{y})+\ell g(\bar{z})}M$ to $\{0,1\}$ such that

$$\psi_{\varphi(\bar{x}_u,\bar{y},\bar{z})}(\bar{x}_u, \bar{d}_{\varphi(\bar{x}_u,\bar{y},\bar{z}),M}) \vdash \{\varphi(\bar{x}_u, \bar{b}, \bar{c})^{\eta(\bar{b}\hat{\ }\bar{c})} : \bar{b} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{y})}M \text{ and } \bar{c} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{z})}M\}.$$

Clearly $|p(\bar{y})| < \kappa$ so there are $\zeta^* < \kappa$ and a sequence $\langle (\varphi_\zeta(\bar{x}_{u_\zeta}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}_\zeta), u_\zeta) : \zeta < \zeta^* \rangle$ listing the pairs $(\varphi(\bar{x}_u, \bar{y}, \bar{z}), u)$ as above so we have

$$p(\bar{y}) = \{\varphi_\zeta(\mathbf{\bar{c}} \restriction u_\zeta, \bar{y}, \bar{c}) : \zeta < \zeta^* < \kappa \text{ and } \bar{c} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{z}_\zeta))}M\}$$

so $u_\zeta \subseteq \alpha^*$ is finite.

For each $\zeta < \zeta^*$ we choose $\psi_\zeta(\bar{x}_{u_\zeta}, \bar{d}_\zeta)$ as guaranteed by $(*)_1$ above.
Let

$$p'(\bar{y}) := \{(\forall \bar{x}_{u_\zeta})[\psi_\zeta(\bar{x}_{u_\zeta}, \bar{d}_\zeta) \rightarrow \varphi_\zeta(\bar{x}_{u_\zeta}, \bar{y}, \bar{c})] : \zeta < \zeta^* \text{ and } \bar{c} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{z}_\zeta)}M\}.$$

Now

- $(*)_2$ $p'(\bar{y})$ is finitely satisfiable in M.

[Why? As $p(\bar{y})$ finitely satisfiable in M, using the translation and the choice of $\psi_\zeta(\bar{x}_{u_\zeta}, \bar{d}_\zeta)$. That is, let $p''(\bar{y})$ be a finite subset of $p'(\bar{y})$ so for some $k < \omega, \zeta_\ell = \zeta(\ell) < \zeta^*, \bar{c}_\ell \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{z}_\zeta)}M$ for $\ell < k$ we have $p'(\bar{y}) = \{(\forall \bar{x}_{u_{\zeta(\ell)}}[\psi_{\zeta(\ell)}(\bar{x}_{u_{\zeta(\ell)}}, \bar{d}_{\zeta(\ell)}) \rightarrow \varphi_\zeta(\bar{x}_{u_{\zeta(\ell)}}, \bar{y}, \bar{c}_\ell)] : \ell < k\}$. Now $\{\varphi_{\zeta_\ell}(\mathbf{\bar{c}} \restriction u_{\zeta_\ell}, \bar{y}, \bar{c}_\ell) : \ell < k\}$ is a finite subset of $p(\bar{y})$ hence is realized by some $\bar{b} \in {}^m M$, hence by the $(*)_1$ the sequence $\bar{b}$ realizes $p''(\bar{y})$.]

$(*)_3$ the type $p'(\bar{y})$ is over $\cup\{\bar{d}_\zeta : \zeta < \zeta^*\} \subseteq N$.

[Why? Check.]

$(*)_4$ $p'(\bar{y})$ has cardinality $\leq |A| + |T| < \kappa$.

[Why? Obvious.]

$(*)_5$ there are M^+ and $\bar{b}$ such that:
- (a) $M \prec M^+ \prec N$
- (b) $\mathrm{tp}(M^+, M \cup \bigcup\{\bar{d}_\zeta : \zeta < \zeta^*\})$ is finitely satisfiable in M
- (c) $\bar{b} \in M^+$ realizing $p'(\bar{y})$.

[Why? Easy, e.g. using ultrapower]

$(*)_6$ $\bar{b}$ realizes $p(\bar{y}) \in \mathbf{S}^m(N \cup A)$ and $\bar{b} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{y})}(M^+) \subseteq {}^{\ell g(\bar{y})}N$.

[Why? Follow the translations.]
So we are done. $\square_{1.14}$

Question 1.16. 1) Can we waive assumption (d) in 1.14?
2) Is the family of (M, A) as in 1.14 "dense under $\leq_\kappa$"?

Discussion 1.17. 1) Assume $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda} > \kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > |T|$ and we try to prove that there is a (λ, κ)-limit model.

So let $M \in \mathrm{EC}_\lambda(T)$ be saturated and we try to analyze the class of $N, M \prec N \in \mathrm{EC}_\lambda$, which are "close enough", in the sense of (λ, κ)-limit model.

So if $p \in \mathbf{S}^{\mathrm{nsp}}_{<\lambda}(M)$, say p does not split over $B, B \subseteq M$ of cardinality $< \lambda$, then we can assume that in N there are "enough elements" realizing "types not-splitting over B" extensions of p. So hopefully we can analyze such N by $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbf{S}^{\mathrm{nsp}}_{\geq\lambda}(M)$ pairwise perpendicular or $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbf{S}^{\mathrm{nsp},|T|}_{\geq\lambda}(M)$ such that for each $p \in \mathcal{P}$ the model $M_{<p>}$ has elimination of quantifiers and is saturated, it is reasonable that this holds if we can expand M by definition of $< \lambda$ types $p \in \mathcal{P}$.

What we need, i.e., what is necessary for this line of attack (but not yet clear if sufficient to carry it)

$(*)$ if $\mathcal{P}_\ell$ above has cardinality λ and is quite dense (e.g. using $\mathbf{F}$'s for $\ell = 1, 2$) <u>then</u> there is an automorphism of M which maps $\mathcal{P}_1$ onto $\mathcal{P}_2$.

This leads to the generic pair conjecture.
About $\mathbf{S}^{\mathrm{nsp}}_{<\lambda}(M)$ recall Definition 1.9(1).
2) We can in "M is κ-saturated, $M \prec N$ and for every $\bar{a} \in {}^{\kappa>}N$, $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{a}, M)$ does not split over some $A \in [M]^{<\kappa}$", replace does not split by finitely satisfiable. However, the use of construction is more cumbersome and there is no real gain so far.

2. The type decomposition theorem

Context 2.1. 1) T is a complete first order theory; dependent if not said otherwise.
2) $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}_T$ is a monster for T, etc. as in 0.1.

Here we try to analyze a type $p \in \mathbf{S}^{\le\theta}(M)$ for κ-saturated $M \prec \mathfrak{C}$ where $\kappa > \theta \ge |T|$, the characteristic case being $\kappa >> \theta$ (θ may be $\aleph_0$, if T is countable). In the case of $\theta < |T|$, or even better $\theta < \aleph_0$ we know less but mention it. We look at "T being stable" as our dream, our paradise. The hard reality is T being just dependent. In some sense T dependent should be like stable but we allow order, e.g. $\mathrm{Th}(\mathbb{Q}, <)$ or trees. What we actually do is investigate the K_ℓ (see Definition 2.5).

How helpful is this analysis? We present two consequences. The first to some extent accomplished the professed aim: the type decomposition theorem 2.3.

What is its meaning? If M is κ-saturated, $\bar{d} \in {}^{\theta^+>}\mathfrak{C}$ and $\kappa > \theta \ge |T|$ then try to analyze the type $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}, M)$ in two steps: for some $\bar{c}, B$

- (a) $B \subseteq M$ has cardinality $< \kappa$, say $B = |N|$
- (b) the type in the first step is similar to the type of stable theories, i.e. $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}, M)$ does not split over $B \subseteq M$; (we can even demand $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}, M)$ is finitely satisfiable in B)
- (c) the type in the second step, $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}, M + \bar{c})$ behaves as in trees; e.g. letting $\mathbf{x} = (M, B, \bar{\mathbf{c}}, \mathbf{d})$ we have: on ${}^{\theta}M$ the partial orders $\le_{\mathbf{x}}$ is κ-directed where we let $\bar{a}_1 \le_{\mathbf{x}} \bar{a}_2$ iff $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}, \bar{c}\hat{\ }\bar{a}_2) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}, \bar{c}\hat{\ }\bar{a}_1)$.

The reader may say that clause (b) is not a true parallel to a stable case, as $|B|$ is not bounded by $\theta + |T|$. Still a type not splitting over a set is a weak form of definability. Also we may wonder, what is the meaning, when T is $\mathrm{Th}(\mathbb{Q}, <)$? If M is κ-saturated each $p \in \mathbf{S}(M)$ actually stands for a cut of M. Now the cuts are divided to those which have cofinality $\ge \kappa$ from both sides (falling under (c)), and those which do not (hence fall full under (b)).

The second consequence deals with singular μ of cofinality $> |T|$. Assume $M \prec \mathfrak{C}$ is exactly μ-saturated, i.e. is μ-saturated but not μ^+-saturated. For e.g. $T = \mathrm{Th}(\mathbb{Q}, <)$ this is impossible, for T stable there is no problem to find such M, e.g. $\mathrm{cf}(\mu) > |T|$ and let M be μ-prime over an indiscernible set of cardinality μ. The result says that for dependent T there is something like that, this is 2.2.

Lemma 2.2. *Singular exact saturation Lemma Assume κ is singular of cofinality $> |T|$ and $M \prec \mathfrak{C}$ is an exactly κ-saturated model, i.e. is κ-saturated but not κ^+-saturated. Then there are N and A such that*

- (a) *$N \prec M$ of cardinality $< \kappa$ and $A \subseteq M$ of cardinality κ and M omits some $p \in \mathbf{S}(A)$ which does not split over N; in fact*
- (b) *there is $q \in \mathbf{S}(M)$ which does not split over N such that $p = q \restriction A$*
- (c) *there is an indiscernible sequence $\langle \bar{a}_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ over N of θ-tuples such that $\mathrm{Av}(\langle \bar{a}_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa \rangle, N \cup \{\bar{a}_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\})$ is omitted by M (equivalently, we cannot choose $a_\kappa \in M$), moreover we can demand that there is an ultrafilter $\mathcal{D}$ on N such that M omits $p = \mathrm{Av}(\mathcal{D}, A)$.*

Theorem 2.3. *The Type Decomposition Theorem Assume* $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > \theta \geq |T|, M$ *is* κ*-saturated and* $\bar{\mathbf{d}} \in {}^{\theta\geq}\mathfrak{C}$. *Then for some* $\bar{c} \in {}^{\theta}\mathfrak{C}$, *recalling Definition 1.9 we have* $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}, M) \in \mathbf{S}^{nsp,\theta}_{<\kappa}(M)$ *and* $(\mathbf{P}, \leq_{\mathbf{P}})$ *is a* κ*-directed partial order where:*

- (a) $\mathbf{P} = \{\mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}, A \cup \bar{\mathbf{c}}) : A \subseteq M \text{ has cardinality } \leq \theta\}$
- (b) $p_1 \leq_{\mathbf{P}} p_2$ *iff* $p_2 \vdash p_1$.

Remark 2.4. 1) In fact $(\mathbf{P}, \leq_{\mathbf{P}})$ is $(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x},\theta}, \leq_{\mathbf{x},\theta})$ from the Definition 2.5(1B) below.
2) Note that being θ^+-directed is obvious.
3) Would it be more transparent to use $p_2 \vdash p_1$ instead of $p_1 \leq_{\mathbf{P}} p_2$? A matter of taste, the author feels that not.

Definition 2.5. 1) Let $K = K_1$ be the family of $\mathbf{x}$ satisfying

- (a) $\mathbf{x} = (A, B, \bar{\mathbf{c}}, \bar{\mathbf{d}})$ but if $A = |M|$, as usual, we may write M instead of A and if $B = \emptyset$ we may omit it
- (b) $B \subseteq A$
- (c) I a linear order
- (d) $\bar{\mathbf{c}} = \langle \bar{c}_{t,n} : n < n_t, t \in I \rangle$ where $n_t \leq \omega$ each $\bar{c}_{t,n}$ a finite [5] sequence and let $\bar{c}_t = \bar{c}_{t,0}{}^\frown \bar{c}_{t,1}{}^\frown \ldots {}^\frown \bar{c}_{t,n_t-1}$
- (e) $\langle \bar{c}_{t,n} : n < n_t \rangle$ is a indiscernible sequence over $A \cup \{\bar{c}_s : s \in I \backslash \{t\}\}$, so if $n_t = 1$ this is an empty statement
- $(f)_1$ if $t \in I$ then[6] $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_t, \{\bar{c}_s : s <_I t\} \cup A)$ does not split over B

2) Let K_0 be defined similarly omitting clause $(f)_1$.
3) For $\lambda \geq \kappa$, $\mathrm{cf}(\lambda) \geq \theta$ (or just $\lambda \geq \theta$), $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) \geq \theta$ and $\ell \in \{0, 1\}$ let $K^{\ell}_{\lambda,\kappa,<\theta} = \{(M, B, \bar{\mathbf{c}}, \bar{\mathbf{d}}) \in K_\ell : M$ is λ-saturated, $|B| < \kappa$ and $|\ell g(\bar{d})| + |\ell g(\bar{\mathbf{c}})|| < \theta\}$, so omitting ℓ means 1. If $\theta = \sigma^+$ instead of "$< \theta$" we may write σ.
4)

- (a) let $\mathbf{x} = (A_{\mathbf{x}}, B_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{x}})$ for $\mathbf{x} \in K_0$ (or $M_{\mathbf{x}}$ instead of $A_{\mathbf{x}}$), $I = I_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{c}_{\mathbf{x},t} = \bar{c}_t, n_t = n_{\mathbf{x},t}$ and $C_{\mathbf{x}} = \cup\{\mathrm{Rang}(\bar{c}_{t,n}) : t \in I \text{ and } n < n_{\mathbf{x},t}\}$
- (b) we may [7] replace $\bar{\mathbf{d}}$ by $D_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathrm{Rang}(\bar{\mathbf{d}})$
- (c) we omit κ if $\kappa = \lambda$ and we omit "$< \theta^+$" if $\theta = |T|^+ \leq \kappa$.

For $\lambda = \aleph_0$, let "$< \lambda$" mean $A_{\mathbf{x}}$ is the universe of $M_{\mathbf{x}} \prec \mathfrak{C}$ (no saturation demand).
5) We define a two-place relation $\leq_0$ on $K_0 : \mathbf{x} \leq_0 \mathbf{y}$ iff $A_{\mathbf{x}} \subseteq A_{\mathbf{y}}, B_{\mathbf{x}} \subseteq B_{\mathbf{y}}, I_{\mathbf{x}} \subseteq I_{\mathbf{y}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}} = \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{y}} \restriction I_{\mathbf{x}}$, i.e. $t \in I_{\mathbf{x}} \Rightarrow \bar{c}_{\mathbf{y},t} = \bar{c}_{\mathbf{x},t}, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}} \trianglelefteq \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{y}}$ and $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}, A_{\mathbf{y}})$ does not split over $B_{\mathbf{x}}$ hence if $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in K^1_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$ then "$\mathrm{tp}(\mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{x}}, A_{\mathbf{y}})$ does not split over $B_{\mathbf{x}}$" follows.
5A) $\mathbf{x} \leq_1 \mathbf{y}$ mean $\mathbf{x} \leq_0 \mathbf{y}$ and $A_{\mathbf{y}} = A_{\mathbf{x}}$.
6) We define a two-place relation $\leq_2$ on $K_0 : \mathbf{x} \leq_2 \mathbf{y}$ iff $\mathbf{x} \leq_1 \mathbf{y} \wedge \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{x}} = \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{y}}$.
7) $\mathbf{x} \in K^0_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$ is called normal when $\mathrm{Rang}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}) \subseteq \mathrm{Rang}(\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}})$.
8) For $\mathbf{x} \in K$, let $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x},\theta} = (\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x},\theta} \leq_{\mathbf{x},\theta})$ be defined by

- (a) $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}} = \{\mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}_{\mathbf{x}}, A + \bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}}) : A \subseteq A_{\mathbf{x}}$ has cardinality $\leq \theta\}$

---

[5] we remark when it matters

[6] of course, this implies clause (e) but see part (1A)

[7] we may write $C_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathrm{Rang}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}), \bar{c}_{\mathbf{x},t,n} = \langle c^{\mathbf{x}}_{t,n,m} : m < \ell g(c_{\mathbf{x},t,n}) \rangle$ so in fact $\bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}} = \langle c^{\mathbf{x}}_{t,n,m} : (t, m, m) \in J \rangle$ for the natural $J = J_{\mathbf{x}}$.

(*b*) $\leq_{\mathbf{x},\theta}$ is the following two-place relation on $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x},\theta} : p_1(\bar{x}_{\bar{d}_{\mathbf{x}}}) \leq_{\mathbf{x},\theta} p_2(\bar{x}_{\bar{d}_{\mathbf{x}}})$ iff $p_2 \vdash p_1$.

8A) If $\theta = |T| + |\ell g(\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}})| + |\ell g(\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}})|$ we may omit it.

Claim 2.6. *1)* $K_1 \subseteq K_0$.
2) $\leq_i$ *is a partial order on* K_0 *for* $i = 0, 1, 2$.
3) If $i \in \{0,1,2\}, \langle \mathbf{x}_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ *is* $\leq_i$*-increasing in* $K^0_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$ *where* δ *is a limit ordinal,* $[\mathrm{cf}(\delta) \geq \theta^+ \Rightarrow \bigwedge\limits_{j<\delta} \mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{x}_j} = \mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{x}_0}]$ *and*[8] $[i \leq 1 \wedge \mathrm{cf}(\delta) \geq \theta^+ \Rightarrow (\bigwedge\limits_{\alpha<\delta} \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha} = \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}_0})], [i = 0 \Rightarrow \lambda \leq \mathrm{cf}(\delta)]$ *and* $\delta < \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) \vee (\bigwedge\limits_{\alpha<\delta} B_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha} = B_{\mathbf{x}_i})$, *then it has a* $\leq_i$-lub $\mathbf{x}_\delta := \cup\{\mathbf{x}_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\} \in K^0_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$ *defined by* $A_{\mathbf{x}} = \cup\{A_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha} : \alpha < \delta\}, B_{\mathbf{x}} = \cup\{B_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha} : \alpha < \delta\}, I_{\mathbf{x}} = \cup\{I_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha} : \alpha < \delta\}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}} = \cup\{\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha} : \alpha < \delta\}$, *i.e.* $\bar{c}_{\mathbf{x},t} = \bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha,t}$ *when* $t \in I_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha}$ *and* $\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}} = \cup\{\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha} : \alpha < \delta\}$.
3A) In part (3), if $\alpha < \delta \Rightarrow \mathbf{x}_\alpha \in K^1_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$ *then* $\mathbf{x}_\delta \in K^1_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$.
4) If $\bar{\mathbf{d}} \in {}^{\theta^+>}\mathfrak{C}$ *and* M *is* κ*-saturated and* $\kappa > \theta$ *then* $\mathbf{x} = (M, \emptyset, <>, \bar{\mathbf{d}})) \in K^i_{\kappa,\theta}$ *for* $i = 0, 1$.
5) In the definition of $\mathbf{x} \in K_0$*: in clause (e) it suffices to demand that: if* $n_t > 1$ *then* $\langle \bar{c}_{t,n} : n < n_t \rangle$ *is indiscernible over* $A \cup \{\bar{c}_{s,m} : s <_I t, m < n_s\}$.
6) For every $\mathbf{x} \in K_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$ *there is a normal* $\mathbf{y} \in K_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$ *satisfying* $\mathbf{x} \leq_1 \mathbf{y}, \bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{y}}$ *and* $\mathrm{Rang}(\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{y}}) = \mathrm{Rang}(\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}}) \cup \mathrm{Rang}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}})$. *Hence* $\mathbf{y} \in \mathrm{mxK}_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta} \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{mxK}_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$*, see Definition 2.7 below.*
7) If $i = 0$ *and* $\langle \mathbf{x}_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ *is* $\leq_i$*-increasing in* $K^0_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$ *and* $\mathrm{cf}(\delta) < \theta^+, \delta < \mathrm{cf}(\kappa)$, *then the sequence has a* $\leq_i$*-upper bound* $\mathbf{x}_\delta \in K^0_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$*, note that we have not said "lub".*
7A) In part (7), if $\alpha < \delta \Rightarrow \mathbf{x}_\alpha \in K^1_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$ *then we can add* $\mathbf{x}_\delta \in K^1_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$.

Proof. Easy e.g.
6) Note that we can choose $\mathbf{y}$ such that $t \in I_{\mathbf{y}} \backslash I_{\mathbf{x}} \Rightarrow n_{\mathbf{y},t} = 1 \wedge \ell g(\bar{c}^{\mathbf{y}}_t) = 1$ and $\{\bar{c}^{\mathbf{y}}_t : t \in I_{\mathbf{y}} \backslash I_{\mathbf{x}}\}$ is $\mathrm{Rang}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}})$ identifying $\langle c \rangle$ with c.
7), 7A) The problem is when part (3) does not cover it, so $\lambda > \aleph_0$. It is clear how to choose $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}_\delta}, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}_\delta}$ and $B_{\mathbf{x}_\delta}$, but we should choose a λ-saturated $M_{\mathbf{x}_\delta}$.

First, choose a λ-saturated M extending $\cup\{M_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha} : \alpha < \delta\}$ but what about "$\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha}, M)$ does not split over $B_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha}$ for each $\alpha < \delta$"?

Now for each $\alpha < \beta < \delta$, $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha}, M_\beta)$ does not split over $B_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha}$ hence $p_{\alpha,\beta}(\bar{x}) = \mathrm{tp}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha}, M_\beta)$ does not split over $B_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha}$ hence $p_\alpha(\bar{x}) := \cup\{p_{\alpha,\beta}(\bar{x}) : \beta \in (\alpha,\delta)\}, \mathrm{tp}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha}, \bigcup\limits_{\beta<\delta} M_\beta)$ does not split over $B_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha}$ for the appropriate $\bar{x}$. So for $\alpha < \delta$ by 1.1(1) there is $\bar{\mathbf{c}}'_\alpha$ such that $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}'_\alpha, M)$ does not split over $B_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha}$ and extends p_α. Hence $\bar{\mathbf{c}}'_\beta \restriction I_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha}$ realizes p_β for $\alpha < \beta < \delta$ hence without loss of generality $\alpha < \beta < \delta \Rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{c}}'_\beta \restriction I_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha} = \bar{\mathbf{c}}_\alpha$.

Hence there is an elementary mapping f mapping with domain $\cup\{\bar{\mathbf{c}}'_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\} \cup M$, mapping $\bar{\mathbf{c}}'_\alpha$ to $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha}$ for $\alpha < \delta$, and extending $\mathrm{id}_{\cup\{M_\alpha : \alpha<\delta\}}$. Now $M_{\mathbf{x}_\delta} := f(M)$ will do. $\square_{2.6}$

Definition 2.7. 1) Let $\mathrm{mxK}^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,<\theta}$ be the family of $\mathbf{x} \in K^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,<\theta}$ which are $\leq^+_2$-maximal in $K^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,<\theta}$, i.e. for no $\mathbf{y}$ do we have $\mathbf{x} <^+_2 \mathbf{y} \in K^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,<\theta}$, see below.
2) For $0 = 1, 2$ let $\leq^+_\ell$ be the following two-place relation on $K_0 : \mathbf{x} \leq^+_i \mathbf{y}$ iff $\mathbf{x} \leq_i \mathbf{y}$, see Definition 2.5 and if $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}$ then for some $t \in I_{\mathbf{y}} \backslash I_{\mathbf{x}}$ satisfying $n_{\mathbf{x},t} \geq 2$

---

[8] this follows from "$\langle \mathbf{x}_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ is $\leq_i$-increasing" when $i = 2$

we have: $\mathfrak{C} \models \varphi[\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{c}_{t,1}, \bar{b}] \wedge \neg\varphi[\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{c}_{t,0}, \bar{b}]$ for some $\varphi = \varphi_t(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_T)$ and $\bar{b} \subseteq A_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \bigcup\{\bar{c}_s : s \in I_{\mathbf{y}} \backslash \{t\}\}$.
3) Again, if $\theta = \sigma^+$ instead of "$< \theta$: we may write σ, and if $\kappa = \lambda$ we may omit λ.
4) Of course, $\mathbf{x} <^+_i \mathbf{y}$ means $\mathbf{x} \le^+_i \mathbf{y} \wedge \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}$.

Observation 2.8. Let $i = 0, 1, 2$.
1) For $\ell = 0, 1$ the two-place relation $\le^+_i$ is a partial order on K^ℓ.
2) If $\mathbf{x}_1 \le_i \mathbf{x}_2 <^+_i \mathbf{x}_3 \le_i \mathbf{x}_4$ then $\mathbf{x}_1 <^+_i \mathbf{x}_4$.
3) If $\mathbf{x} <^+_i \mathbf{z}$ are from $K^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,<\theta}$ then there is $\mathbf{y} \in K^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,<\theta}$ such that $\mathbf{x} <^+_2 \mathbf{y} \le_i \mathbf{z}$ and $\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{x}}, I_{\mathbf{y}} \backslash I_{\mathbf{x}}$ is finite.

Proof. E.g.
3) Let $t \in I_{\mathbf{z}} \backslash I_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\varphi = \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_T)$ be such that $\mathfrak{C} \models \varphi[\bar{d}_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{c}_{\mathbf{y},t,1}, \bar{b}] \wedge \neg\varphi[\bar{d}_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{c}_{\mathbf{y},t,0}, \bar{b}]$. We choose a finite $I \subseteq I_{\mathbf{y}} \backslash \{t\}$ such that $\bar{b} \subseteq \cup\{\bar{c}_s : s \in I\} \cup A_{\mathbf{x}}$. Now define $\mathbf{y}$ by: $M_{\mathbf{y}} = M_{\mathbf{x}}, I_{\mathbf{y}} = I_{\mathbf{x}} \cup I, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{y}} = \bar{c}_{\mathbf{z}} \restriction I_{\mathbf{y}}, \bar{d}_{\mathbf{y}} = \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $B_{\mathbf{y}} = B_{\mathbf{x}}$.
Now check. $\square_{2.8}$

The following claim may be good for digesting the meaning $\mathrm{mxK}^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,t}$.

Claim 2.9. *The L.S.T. Claim for* mxK
If $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{mxK}_{\kappa,\theta}$ and $M = M_{\mathbf{x}}$ then for some function F with domain $[M]^{<\kappa}$ satisfying $F(A) \in [M]^{\le 2^{|A|+|T|}}$ for $A \in \mathrm{Dom}(F)$, we have: if $M_1 \prec M$ is closed under F and contains $B_{\mathbf{x}}$ then $(M_1, B_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}})$ belongs to $\mathrm{mxK}^\ell_{\kappa,\theta}$.

Proof. We can choose $F(\emptyset) \in [M]^1$ and fix a set J of cardinality $\aleph_0$ disjoint to $I_{\mathbf{x}}$.
Note that for every $N \prec M$ satisfying $B_{\mathbf{x}} \subseteq N$ we have $\mathbf{x}_N := (N, B_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{d}_{\mathbf{x}}) \in K_{\kappa,\theta}$; call such N a candidate. So to choose F let us analyze the caes $B_{\mathbf{x}} \subseteq N \prec M$ but $\mathbf{x}_N \notin \mathrm{mxK}^\ell_{\kappa,\theta}$. Considering Definition 2.7, it suffices by 2.8(3) to consider the case $\mathbf{x}_N <^+_2 \mathbf{y}, I_{\mathbf{y}} \backslash I_{\mathbf{x}}$ is finite and is $\subseteq J, t_* \in I_{\mathbf{y}} \backslash I_{\mathbf{x}}, \varphi_*(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}), \bar{b}_*$ as there, we can ignore the possibility that also some other $t \in I_{\mathbf{y}} \backslash I_{\mathbf{x}} \backslash \{t_*\}$ works.
We let $\bar{b}_0$ list $B_{\mathbf{y}}, I_{\mathbf{y}} \backslash I_{\mathbf{x}} = \{t_0, \ldots, t_{n-1}\}, t_* = t_{\ell(*)}, \ell(*) < n, m_{t,i} = \ell g(\bar{c}_{\mathbf{y},t,\ell}), k_t = k_{\mathbf{y},t}$. Also without loss of generality $\varphi = \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}; \bar{z}_1, z), \ell g(\bar{y}) = \ell g(\bar{c}_{\mathbf{y},t_*,0}), \ell g(\bar{x}) = \ell g(\bar{d}_{\mathbf{x}}), \bar{b} = \bar{b}_1{}^\frown\bar{b}_2, \bar{b}_2 \in {}^{\omega>}(M_{\mathbf{y}}) = {}^{\omega>}N, \ell g(\bar{z}_1) = \ell g(\bar{b}_1)$ and abusing our notation $\bar{b}_2 = \langle \bar{c}_{t,k} : k < k_{\mathbf{y},t}, t \in I_{\mathbf{y}} \backslash \{t_*\}\rangle$, so $\mathfrak{C} \models \varphi[\bar{d}_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{c}_{\mathbf{y},t_*,1}, \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2] \wedge \neg\varphi[\bar{d}_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{c}_{\mathbf{y},t_*,0}, \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2]$ and let $\ell g(\bar{z}_t) = \ell g(\bar{c}_t), \ell g(\bar{z}_{t,\ell}) = \ell g(\bar{c}_{t,\ell})$ so $\bar{z}_t = \bar{z}_{t,0}{}^\frown\bar{z}_{t,2}$ and $\bar{z}_2 = (\ldots, \bar{z}_t, \ldots)_{t \in I_{\mathbf{y}}}$.
All this information will be called a witness against the candidate N and we denote it by $\mathbf{w}$.
Let $\mathbf{s}$ consist of the following pieces of information on the witness $\mathbf{w}$ and we shall say that $\mathbf{w}$ materializes $\mathbf{s}$ and $\mathbf{s}$ is a case for N

☒ (a) $I = I_{\mathbf{y}}$ and $\langle t_\ell : \ell < k\rangle$ (so we will write $I_{\mathbf{s}}, k_{\mathbf{s}}, t_{\mathbf{s},\ell}$)
(b) $k_t, m_t, m_{t,\ell}$ for $t \in I, \ell < k_t$
(c) $\varphi = \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)$ hence $\ell g(\bar{b}_1)$
(d) $\zeta(0) = \ell g(\bar{b}_0)$ and $\ell g(\bar{c}_{\mathbf{y},t,\ell})$
(e) $q_0 = \mathrm{tp}(\bar{b}_0, \emptyset)$ and $q_1 = \mathrm{tp}(\bar{b}_0{}^\frown\bar{b})$
(f) the scheme of non-splitting of $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_t, M)$ for $t \in I_{\mathbf{y}}$ from clause $(f)_2$ of 2.5(1), that is $\Xi_t = \{(\psi(\bar{z}_{\bar{\mathbf{c}}_t}, \bar{y}'), q(\bar{y}', \bar{y}_{\bar{b}_0}))$: for some $\bar{b} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{y}')}N$ we have $\mathfrak{C} \models \psi[\bar{\mathbf{c}}_t, \bar{b}]$ and $q(\bar{y}', \bar{y}_{\bar{b}_0}) = \mathrm{tp}(\bar{b}{}^\frown\bar{b}_0, \emptyset)\}$.

We shall write $\varphi = \varphi^s_{\mathbf{s}}$, etc. and let $q_N = \operatorname{tp}(\bar{c}_{\mathbf{y}}, N)$. We call $\mathbf{s}$ a case when it is a case for some candidate N. If $\mathbf{s}$ is a case and $\bar{b}_0 \in {}^{\zeta(0)}(M_{\mathbf{x}})$ realizes q_0, then we can choose $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{s},\bar{b}_0} = \langle \bar{c}_{\mathbf{x},\bar{b}_0,t} : t \in I_{\mathbf{s}} \rangle$ such that $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{c}_{\mathbf{s},\bar{b}_0,t}, \cup\{\bar{c}_{\mathbf{s},\bar{b}_0,s} : s <_{I_{\mathbf{s}}} t\} \cup M_{\mathbf{x}})$ is defined by the scheme Ξ_t with the parameter $\bar{b}_0$, this type is determined by $\mathbf{s}$ and $\mathbf{x}$ (though not the $\bar{c}_{\mathbf{s},\bar{b}_0,t}$'s themselves). Without loss of generality $t \in I_{\mathbf{x}} \Rightarrow \bar{c}_{\mathbf{s},\bar{b}_0,t} = \bar{c}_{\mathbf{x},t}$.

Now clearly

$(*)_1$ for a candidate N we have $\mathbf{x}_N \in K_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$ iff for every case $\mathbf{s}$ and $\bar{b}_0 \in {}^{\zeta(0)}N$ realizing $q_{\mathbf{s},0}$ there is no $\bar{b}_i \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{y})}N$ such that $\mathbf{s}_1, \bar{b}_0, \bar{b}_2, \bar{b}_2 = \bar{c}_{\mathbf{s},\bar{b}_0}$ are as above.

So

$(*)_2$ for every case $\mathbf{s}, \bar{b}_0 \in {}^{\zeta(0)}(M_{\mathbf{x}})$ realizing $q_{\mathbf{s},0}$ and $\bar{b}_2 \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{y})}M$, we cannot choose $\bar{\mathbf{c}}', \bar{c}''$ realizing $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{s},\bar{b}_0}, M_{\mathbf{x}})$ such that $\bar{\mathbf{c}}' {\restriction} I_{\mathbf{x}} = \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}} = \bar{\mathbf{c}}'' {\restriction} I_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\mathfrak{C} \models \varphi_{\mathbf{s}}[\bar{d}_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{c}'_{t_*,\mathbf{s}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}' {\restriction} (I_{\mathbf{s}} \backslash \{t_*(\mathbf{s})\}), \bar{b}_1] \wedge \neg\varphi_{\mathbf{s}}[\bar{d}_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{c}''_{t'_*(\mathbf{s})}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}' {\restriction} (I_{\mathbf{x}} \backslash \{t_*(\mathbf{s})\}), \bar{b}_1]$.

[Why? As then $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{mxK}_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$.]

Hence

$(*)_3$ for every case $\mathbf{s}$ and $\bar{b}_0 \in {}^{\zeta(0)}(M_{\mathbf{x}})$ realizing $q_{\mathbf{s},0}$ and $\bar{b}_2 \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{y})}(M_{\mathbf{x}})$ there is a finite set $C = C_{\mathbf{s}}(\bar{b}_0, b_1) \subseteq M_{\mathbf{x}}$ such that: if N is a candidate which includes $\bar{b}_0, \bar{b}_1, C$ then there is no witness $\mathbf{w}$ against N with $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{s}_{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{b}_0 = \bar{b}_{\mathbf{w},0}, \bar{b}_1 = \bar{b}_{\mathbf{w},1}$.

Also

$(*)_4$ for $B \subseteq M$ of cardinality $< \kappa$ let $C(B)$ be a subset of M of cardinality $\leq 2^{|B|+|T|}$ in which every $p \in \mathbf{S}^{<\omega}(B)$ is realized.

Lastly, let F be defined for $B \in [M]^{<\kappa}, F(B) = \cup\{C_{\mathbf{t}}(\bar{b}_0, \bar{b}_3) : \mathbf{t}$ a case and $\bar{b}_0, \bar{b}_3$ suitable sequences from $B\} \cup C(B)$.

Now the number of cases is $\leq \aleph_0 + \aleph_0 + \aleph_0 + |T| + \theta + 2^{|T|+|A|} = 2^{|T|+|A|}$, so $F(B) \in [M]^{\leq\theta}$. So we are done. $\square_{2.9}$

Theorem 2.10. *The Existence Theorem* *If* $\ell = 0, 1$ *and* $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > \theta \geq |T|$ *and* $\mathbf{x} \in K^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$ *then* *there is* $\mathbf{y}$ *such that* $\mathbf{x} \leq_2 \mathbf{y} \in \mathrm{mxK}^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$.

Remark 2.11. 1) If we use $K^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,<\theta}$ instead of "$\theta \geq |T|$" we should demand "$\mathrm{cf}(\theta) > |T|$".
2) We may get more. E.g. demand $I_{\mathbf{y}} = I_1 \cup I_2, I_1 < I_2$ and $I_1 = I_{\mathbf{x}}, I_2$ is well ordered.
2A) Also this claim holds when we replace clause $(f)_1$ in Definition 2.5(1) by

$(f)_2$ $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}, A_{\mathbf{x}})$ is finitely satisfiable in $B_{\mathbf{x}}$.

Then in part (2) of the remark we may add

$(*)$ for $t \in I_2$, $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{c}_t, M_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \{\bar{c}_{\mathbf{y},s} : s <_{I_{\mathbf{y}}} t\})$ is finitely satisfiable in $B_{\mathbf{y}}$.

3) We can be more relaxed in the demands on $\langle \mathbf{x}_\alpha : \alpha < \theta^+ \rangle$ in the proof e.g. it suffices to demand

$\circledast'$ (a) $\mathbf{x}_\alpha \in K^0_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$

(b) $\mathbf{x}_\alpha$ is $\le_1$-increasing continuous, natural to demand $\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha} = \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}_0}$ but not necessary, and

(c) for each $\alpha < \theta^+$ (or just for stationarily many $\alpha < \theta^+$) we have $\mathbf{x}_\alpha <^+_1 \mathbf{x}_{\alpha+1}$.

[Why? Let $\bar{d}_{\mathbf{x}_1} \restriction u_\alpha$ (u_α finite) $t_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha(\bar{x}_\alpha, \bar{y}_\alpha, \bar{b}_\alpha)$ witness $\mathbf{x}_\alpha <^+_1 \mathbf{x}_{\alpha+1}$ when $\alpha \in S_0$ where $S_0 := \{\alpha < \theta^+ : \mathbf{x}_\alpha <^+_1 \mathbf{x}_{\alpha+1}\}$. For $\alpha \in S$ let $h(\alpha) = \mathrm{Min}\{\gamma : \bar{d}_{\mathbf{x}_\gamma} \restriction u_\alpha = \bar{d}_{\mathbf{x}_\gamma} \restriction u_\alpha$ and $\mathrm{Rang}(\bar{b}_\alpha) \cap (A_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha} + \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha}) \subseteq A_{\mathbf{x}_\gamma} + \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}_\gamma}\}$, clearly $h(\alpha) < \alpha$ for α limit.

So by Fodor lemma for some $\beta < \alpha$ and u the set $S = \{\delta \in S_0 : \delta$ is a limit ordinal as in clause (c) above $u_\delta = u$ and $h(\delta) = \beta\}$ is stationary. As $\theta \ge |T|$, for some [9] formula φ the set $S_2 := \{\delta \in S_1 : \varphi_\delta = \varphi\}$ is a stationary subset of θ^+ and we continue as in the proof.

4) How does part (3) of the remarks help? E.g. if we like to get $\mathbf{y} \in \mathrm{mxK}^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$ which is normal and $\mathrm{Rang}(\bar{\mathbf{d}}_\mathbf{y})$ is universe of some $N \prec \mathfrak{C}$.

Proof. Assume this fails. We try to choose $\mathbf{x}_\alpha$ by induction on $\alpha < \theta^+$ such that

$\circledast$ (a) $\mathbf{x}_\alpha \in K^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$

(b) $\mathbf{x}_\beta \le_1 \mathbf{x}_\alpha$ for $\beta < \alpha$

(c) if $\alpha = \beta + 1$ then $\mathbf{x}_\beta <^+_\ell \mathbf{x}_\alpha$, i.e. $\mathbf{x}_\alpha$ witness $\mathbf{x}_\beta \notin \mathrm{mxK}^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$ (i.e. is like $\mathbf{y}$ in Definition 2.7);

(d) $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{x}$.

For $\alpha = 0$ use clause (d), for $\alpha = \beta + 1$ we use our assumption toward contradiction. For α limit use 2.6(3).

Having carried the induction, for each $\alpha < \theta^+$ there are $t_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_\alpha, \bar{z}_\alpha), \bar{b}_\alpha$ satisfying: $t_\alpha \in I_{\mathbf{x}_{\alpha+1}} \backslash I_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha}, \varphi_\alpha(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_\alpha, \bar{z}_\alpha) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_T), \bar{b}_\alpha \subseteq M_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha} \cup \bigcup\{\bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}_{\alpha+1},s} : s \in I_{\mathbf{x}_{\alpha+1}} \backslash \{t_\alpha\}\}$ and $\ell g(\bar{b}_\alpha) = \ell g(\bar{z}_\alpha), \ell g(\bar{y}_\alpha) = \ell g(\bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}_{\alpha+1},t_\alpha,0})$ such that $\mathfrak{C} \models \neg\varphi_\alpha[\bar{\mathbf{d}}_\mathbf{x}, \bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}_{\alpha+1},t_\alpha,0}, \bar{b}_\alpha] \wedge \varphi_\alpha[\bar{\mathbf{d}}_\mathbf{x}, \bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}_{\alpha+1},t_\alpha,1}, \bar{b}_\alpha]$ so $\ell g(\bar{x}) = \ell g(\bar{\mathbf{d}}_\mathbf{x})$ and $n_{t_\alpha} \ge 2$. Clearly the sequence $\langle t_\alpha : \alpha < \theta^+\rangle$ is without repetitions. Now let $J_\alpha \subseteq I_{\mathbf{x}_{\alpha+1}} \backslash \{t_\alpha\}$ be finite such that $\bar{b}_\alpha \subseteq M_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha} \cup \bigcup\{\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{x_{\alpha+1},s} : s \in J_\alpha\}$. By the Δ-system lemma for finite sets applied to the sequence $\langle J_\alpha \cup \{t_\alpha\} : \alpha < \theta^+\rangle$ we can find an unbounded (and even stationary) set $S_1 \subseteq \theta^+$ and formula $\varphi = \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z})$ such that $\delta \in S_1 \Rightarrow \varphi_\delta = \varphi \wedge J_\delta \cap \{t_\beta : \beta \in S_1\} = \emptyset$. Note that there are $\le \theta$ possibilities for φ, not necessarily $\le |T|$ and though $\varphi_\alpha(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_\alpha, \bar{z}_\alpha)$ depend only on $\bar{x} \restriction u$ for some finite $u \subseteq \ell g(\bar{x})$ there are $\le \ell g(\bar{\mathbf{d}}_\mathbf{x}) + \aleph_0$ possibilities for u.

Now we prove that $\varphi(\bar{x}; \bar{y}, \bar{z})$ has the independence property (for T), a contradiction.

For every $u \subseteq v \subseteq S_1$ and $\eta \in {}^u 2$ let:

(a) $A_{\eta,v} = A_\mathbf{x} \cup \{\bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}_{\beta+1},t,n} : t \in J_\beta$ and $n < n_{\mathbf{x}_{\beta+1},t}$ for some $\beta \in v \backslash u\} \cup \{\bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}_{\alpha+1},t_\alpha,\eta(\alpha)} : \alpha \in u\}$

(b) $f_{\eta,v}$ is the function with

(α) domain $A_{\eta,v}$

---

[9] if $\bar{c}_{t_\alpha,n}$ is infinite we let $u_\alpha \subseteq \ell g(\bar{c}^{\mathbf{x}_\alpha}_{t_\alpha,0})$ be finite such that $\mathfrak{C} \models \varphi_\alpha[\bar{\mathbf{d}}_\mathbf{x}, \bar{c}^{\mathbf{x}_{\alpha+1}}_{t_\alpha,0} \restriction u_\alpha, \bar{b}_\alpha] \wedge \neg\varphi_\alpha[\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}_\alpha}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}^{\mathbf{x}_{\alpha+1}}_{t_\alpha,1}, \bar{b}_\alpha]$ and the rest is the same.

(β) is the identity on $A_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \{\bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}_{\beta+1},t,n} : t \in J_\beta$ and $n < n_{\mathbf{x}_{\beta+1},t}$ for some $\beta \in v \backslash u\}$

(γ) $f_{\eta,v}(\bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}_{\alpha+1},t_\alpha,\eta(\alpha)}) = \bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}_{\alpha+1},t_\alpha,0}$ for $\alpha \in u =$ Dom(η).

Now

$(*)$ $f_{\eta,v}$ is an elementary mapping.

[Why? Without loss of generality $u \subseteq v$ are finite so $\subseteq \alpha(*)$ for some $\alpha(*) < \theta^+$ and prove this by induction on $|u|$ as for $\alpha \in u$ the sequence $\langle \bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}_{d(*)},t,k} : k < k_{\mathbf{x}_{\alpha(*)},t}\rangle$ is indiscernible over $A_{\mathbf{x}_{\alpha(*)}} \cup \{\bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}_{\alpha(*)},s} : s \in I_{\mathbf{x}_{\alpha(*)}} \backslash \{t\}$, by Definition 2.5(1), clause (e).]

Now let $g_{\eta,v} \in \mathrm{aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ extends $f_{\eta,v}$. So $\alpha \in u \Rightarrow g_{\eta,v}(\bar{b}_\alpha) = f_\eta(\bar{b}_\alpha) = \bar{b}_\alpha$ and $g_{\eta,\nu}(\bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}_{\alpha+1},t_\alpha,\eta(\alpha)}) = \bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}_{\alpha+1},t_\alpha,0}$ for $\alpha \in u$ by the choice of J_α so for $\eta \in {}^u 2$ we have

$(*)$ $\mathfrak{C} \models \varphi[g_{\eta,v}(\bar{\mathbf{d}}), \bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}_{\alpha+1},t_\alpha,0}, \bar{b}_\alpha]$ iff $\eta(\alpha) = 1$.

So $\langle \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}_{\alpha+1},t_\alpha,0}, \bar{b}_\alpha) : t \in u\rangle$ is an independent sequence of formulas, contradiction as promised. $\square_{2.10}$

Claim 2.12. The Weak Orthogonality Claim

Assume $\ell = 0,1$ *and* $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{mxK}^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$.

1) If $m < \omega, B' \subseteq M_{\mathbf{x}}$ *and*[10] $|B'| < \kappa$ *and* $q \in \mathbf{S}^m(M_{\mathbf{x}} \cup C_{\mathbf{x}})$ *does not split over* B' then $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{\mathbf{d}}, M_{\mathbf{x}} \cup C_{\mathbf{x}})$ *is weakly orthogonal to* q.

1A) It suffices[11] *that* $q = \mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_1 \char`^ \bar{c}_2, M_{\mathbf{x}} \cup C_{\mathbf{x}})$, $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_1, M_{\mathbf{x}})$ *does not split over some* $B' \in [M]^{<\kappa}$, $\mathrm{tp}(C_{\mathbf{x}}, M_{\mathbf{x}} + \bar{c}_1)$ *does not split over* $B_{\mathbf{x}}$ *and* $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_2, M_{\mathbf{x}} + \bar{c}_1 + C_{\mathbf{x}})$ *does not split over some* $B''' \in [M_{\mathbf{x}}]^{<\kappa}$.

2) If $\mathbf{x}_\alpha \in \mathrm{mxK}^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$ *for* $\alpha < \delta$ *is* $\leq_0$*-increasing,* $\delta < \theta^+$ *and* $\mathbf{x}_\delta := \cup\{\mathbf{x}_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\}$ *belongs to* $K^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$ *(recall 2.6(3))* then *it also belongs to* $\mathrm{mxK}^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$.

Proof. 1) Assume toward contradiction that those types are not weakly orthogonal. Let $q = q(\bar{y}), \bar{y} = \langle y_k : k < m\rangle$ and let $\bar{x} = \langle x_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle$ recalling $\alpha_{\mathbf{x}} = \ell g(\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}})$ and $p(\bar{x}) = \mathrm{tp}(\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}}, M_{\mathbf{x}} \cup C_{\mathbf{x}})$. So for some formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z})$ and $\bar{e} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{z})}(M_{\mathbf{x}} \cup C_{\mathbf{x}})$ the type $p(\bar{x}) \cup q(\bar{y})$ does not decide $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{e})$, i.e. $r_{\mathbf{t}}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = p(\bar{x}) \cup q(\bar{y}) \cup \{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{e})^{\mathbf{t}}\}$ is consistent ($=$ finitely satisfiable in $\mathfrak{C}$) for $\mathbf{t} = 0,1$ and let $\bar{c}'_0, \bar{c}'_1$ be such that $\bar{\mathbf{d}} \char`^ \bar{c}'_{\mathbf{t}}$ realizes $r_{\mathbf{t}}(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ for $\mathbf{t} = 0,1$. Now it cannot be that $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}'_{\mathbf{t}}, M_{\mathbf{x}} \cup C_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}})$ does not split over B' for both $\mathbf{t} = 0,1$ (by 1.1(1), as every $p \in \mathbf{S}^{<\omega}(B')$ is realized in M recalling M is κ-saturated and $\kappa > |B'|$). So choose $\bar{c}_0 \in \{\bar{c}'_0, \bar{c}'_1\}$ such that the type $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_0, M_{\mathbf{x}} \cup C_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{d}})$ splits over B'.

Now by 1.1(1) there is $\bar{c}_1 \in {}^m\mathfrak{C}$ such that $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_1, M_{\mathbf{x}} \cup C_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \bar{c}_0)$ extends $q(\bar{y})$ and does not split over B'. Hence also $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_1, M_{\mathbf{x}} \cup C_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}})$ does not split over B', hence is $\neq \mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_0, M_{\mathbf{x}} \cup C_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}})$. We can continue and choose $\bar{c}_n$ $(n = 2, 3 \ldots)$ realizing the complete type over $M_{\mathbf{x}} \cup C_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{d}}_x \cup \bigcup\{\bar{c}_k : k < n\}$ which extends q does not split over B'. Hence

$(*)_0$ for every $n < \omega$, $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_n, M_{\mathbf{x}} \cup C_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \bigcup\{\bar{c}_k : k < n\})$ extend $q(\bar{y})$ and does not split over B'.

So by 1.1(2)

---

[10] this is just to ensure that M realizes every $q \in \mathbf{S}^{<\omega}(B')$

[11] even more as we can increase the linear order $I_{\mathbf{x}}$

$(*)_1$ $\langle \bar{c}_n : n < \omega \rangle$ is an indiscernible sequence over $M_{\mathbf{x}} \cup C_{\mathbf{x}}$.

Also (by induction on $\gamma \leq \omega$) by 1.1(3) we have:

$(*)_2$ if $t \in I_{\mathbf{x}}$ then $\langle \bar{c}_{\mathbf{x},t,n} : n < n_t \rangle$ is indiscernible over $M_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \{\bar{c}_{\mathbf{x},s,m} : s \in I \backslash \{t\}\} \cup \{\bar{c}_n : n < \gamma\}$.

Now we define $\mathbf{y} = (M_{\mathbf{y}}, B_{\mathbf{y}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{y}}, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_y)$ by

$\circledast$ (a) $M_{\mathbf{y}} = M_{\mathbf{x}}$
(b) $B_{\mathbf{y}} = B_{\mathbf{x}} \cup B'$
(c) $\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{y}} = \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}}$
(d) $I_{\mathbf{y}} = I_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \{s(*)\}$ were $[t \in I_{\mathbf{x}} \Rightarrow t <_{I_{\mathbf{y}}} s(*)]$
(e) $\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{y}} \restriction I_{\mathbf{x}} = \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}$
(f) $n_{\mathbf{y},s(*)} = \omega$ (or any number $\in [2,\omega]$) and $\bar{c}_{\mathbf{y},s(*),n} = \bar{c}_n$.

Now $\mathbf{y}$ contradicts the assumption $\mathbf{x} \in \text{mxK}^{\ell}_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$.
1A) Similarly.
2) Easy. $\square_{2.12}$

The following claim is a crucial step toward proving the type decomposition theorem 2.3.

Claim 2.13. *If $\mathbf{x} \in \text{mxK}^{\ell}_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$ (or just $\mathbf{x} \in K$ and $\circledast$ below) then for every $A \subseteq M_{\mathbf{x}}$ of cardinality $< \kappa$ and $\varphi = \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_T)$ satisfying $\ell g(\bar{x}) = \ell g(\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}}), \ell g(\bar{z}) = \ell g(\bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}}), \ell g(\bar{y}) = m$, there is $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{e}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}) \in \text{tp}(\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}}, M_{\mathbf{x}} \cup C_{\mathbf{x}})$ satisfying $\bar{e} \in {}^{\omega>}M_{\mathbf{x}}$ such that $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{e}, \bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}}) \vdash \{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}})^{\mathbf{t}} : \bar{b} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{y})}A$ and $\mathbf{t} \in \{0,1\}$ are such that $\mathfrak{C} \models \varphi[\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{b}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}]^{\mathbf{t}}\}$ where*

$\circledast$ if $q(\bar{y}) \in \mathbf{S}^{\ell g(\bar{y})}(M_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}})$ is finitely satisfiable in some $A \subseteq M_{\mathbf{x}}$ of cardinality $< \kappa$ then $q(\bar{y})$ is weakly orthogonal to $\text{tp}(\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}}, M_{\mathbf{x}} \cup C_{\mathbf{x}})$.

Proof. By 2.12, if $\mathbf{x} \in \text{mxK}_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$ then $\circledast$ holds; hence we can in any case assume $\circledast$.

Let $p(\bar{x}) = \text{tp}(\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}}, M \cup C_{\mathbf{x}})$, so $\bar{x} = \langle x_i : i < \ell g(\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}}) \rangle$ and recalling $\bar{y} = \langle y_\ell : \ell < m \rangle$ we define a set $r = r(\bar{y})$ as follows

$$r(\bar{y}) := \{(\exists \bar{x})(\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}})^{\mathbf{t}} \wedge \psi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}})) : \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{t} \in \{0,1\} \text{ and} \\ \psi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}) \in p(\bar{x}) \text{ and } \bar{a} \in {}^{\omega>}(M_{\mathbf{x}})\}. \end{array}$$

Now

$\odot_1$ $r(\bar{y})$ is not finitely satisfiable in ${}^m A$.

[Why? Otherwise, i.e. if $r(\bar{y})$ is finitely satisfiable in ${}^m A$, then there is an ultrafilter $\mathcal{D}$ on ${}^m A$ such that for every $\vartheta(\bar{y}, \bar{a}, \bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}}) \in r(\bar{y})$, the set $\{\bar{b} : \bar{b} \in {}^m\mathfrak{C}$ and $\models \vartheta[\bar{b}, \bar{a}, \bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}}]\}$ belongs to $\mathcal{D}$. Let $q(\bar{y}) = \text{Av}(\mathcal{D}, M_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}})$, clearly $q(\bar{y}) \in \mathbf{S}^m(M_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}})$ is finitely satisfiable in ${}^m A, A \subseteq M$ and $|A| < \kappa$. Let $\bar{b}^*$ realize $q(\bar{y})$, so $(\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}) \in p(\bar{x})) \wedge \mathbf{t} \in \{0,1\} \Rightarrow \mathfrak{C} \models (\exists \bar{x})(\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}^*, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}})^{\mathbf{t}} \wedge \psi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}))$. Why? This holds by the choices of $r(\bar{y}), \mathcal{D}$ and $\bar{b}^*$. As $p(\bar{x})$ is closed under conjunctions it follows that $p(\bar{x}) \cup \{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}^*, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}})^{\mathbf{t}}\}$ is finitely satisfiable in $\mathfrak{C}$ for $\mathbf{t} = 0, 1$. But this contradicts the assumption $\circledast$.]

Hence for some $n < \omega$ and $\psi_\ell(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_\ell, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}) \in p(\bar{x})$ for $\ell < n$ we have

$\odot_2$ for no $\bar{b} \in {}^m A$ do we have $(\exists \bar{x})(\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}})^{\mathbf{t}} \wedge \psi_\ell(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_\ell, \bar{c}_{\mathbf{x}}))$ for $\ell < n, \mathbf{t} \in \{0,1\}$.

Let $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}) = \bigwedge\limits_{\ell<n} \psi_\ell(\bar{x}, \bar{a}_\ell, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}})$, so clearly

$\odot_3$ (a) $\bar{a} \in {}^{\omega>}(M_{\mathbf{x}})$

(b) $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}) \in p(\bar{x})$

(c) for no $\bar{b} \in {}^m A$ do we have $\bigwedge\limits_{\mathbf{t}=0}^{1} (\exists \bar{x})(\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}})^{\mathbf{t}} \wedge \psi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}))$.

So for every $\bar{b} \in {}^m A$ for some $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{t}(\bar{b}) \in \{0,1\}$ we have $\mathfrak{C} \models \neg(\exists \bar{x})(\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}})^{\mathbf{t}} \wedge \psi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}))$ hence $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}) \vdash \neg\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}})^{\mathbf{t}(\bar{b})}$. As $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}) \in p(\bar{x}) = \operatorname{tp}(\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}}, M_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{x}})$ it follows that $\neg\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}})^{\mathbf{t}(\bar{b})} \in p(\bar{x})$.

So $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}})$ is as required. $\square_{2.13}$

Claim 2.14. *Assume* $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{mxK}^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$. *If* $B' \subseteq M_{\mathbf{x}}, |B'| < \kappa, \bar{d} \in {}^m(D_{\mathbf{x}}), \bar{c} \in {}^{\omega>}(C_{\mathbf{x}}), \varphi = \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}), \ell g(\bar{x}) = \ell g(\bar{d}), \ell g(\bar{z}) = \ell g(\bar{c})$ *then for some* $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}', \bar{z}')$ *and* $\bar{e}' \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{y}')}(M_{\mathbf{x}})$ *we have* $\models \psi[\bar{d}, \bar{b}', \bar{c}]$ *and*

$$\psi(x, \bar{e}, \bar{c}) \vdash \{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}, \bar{c})^{\mathbf{t}} : \bar{b} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{y})}(B') \text{ and } \mathfrak{C} \models \varphi[\bar{d}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}]^{\mathbf{t}}\}.$$

Proof. This just reformulates 2.13; see more in 2.18(0). $\square_{2.14}$

Now at last

Proof. Proof of 2.3, The Type Decomposition Theorem

By 2.6(4) there is $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{K}^1_{\kappa,\leq\theta}$ such that $\mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{x}} = \bar{\mathbf{d}}$ and $M_{\mathbf{x}} = M$. By Claim 2.10 without loss of generality $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{mxK}^1_{\kappa,\leq\theta}$. Clearly $(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x},\theta}, \leq_{\mathbf{x},\theta})$ is a partial order. Assume that $\alpha(*) < \kappa$ and $p_\alpha \in \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x},\theta}$ for $\alpha < \alpha(*)$. Let $B = \bigcup\{\mathrm{Dom}(p_\alpha) : \alpha < \alpha(*)\} \cup B_{\mathbf{x}}$, so $B \subseteq M_{\mathbf{x}}$ has cardinality $< \kappa$. Hence by **??** for every $v \subseteq \ell g(\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}})$ and $\varphi = \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z})$ satisfying $\ell g(\bar{z}) = \ell g(\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}), \ell g(\bar{x}) = \ell g(\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}}), \ell g(\bar{y}) < \omega$ there is $\psi = \psi_\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{e}_\varphi, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}) \in \operatorname{tp}(\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}}, M \cup \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}})$ where $\bar{e}_\varphi \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{y}')}(M_{\mathbf{x}})$ such that $\psi_\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{e}_\varphi, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}) \vdash \{\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}})^{\mathbf{t}} : \bar{b} \in {}^{\ell g(\bar{y})}B$ and $\mathfrak{C} \models \varphi[\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{b}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}]^{\mathbf{t}}\}$.

Let $A = \cup\{\mathrm{Rang}(\bar{b}_\varphi) : \varphi \text{ as above}\}$, and let $p = \operatorname{tp}(\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}}, A \cup \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}})$, it is an upper bound as required. $\square_{2.3}$

Discussion 2.15. The type decomposition theorems say that we can analyze a type $p \in \mathbf{S}(M)$ in two steps; first $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{c}, M)$ does not split over some "small" $B \subseteq M$. Second, $\operatorname{tp}(\bar{d}, \bar{c} + M)$ is like a type in the theory of trees and lastly without loss of generality by 2.6(6) some initial segment of $\bar{d}$ realize p. As an example (see [Sh:877]).

Exercise 2.16. Let $T = T_{\mathrm{ord}}$ be $\mathrm{Th}(\mathbb{Q}, <)$ and if $M \prec \mathfrak{C}_T, M$ is κ-saturated, in the main case and $p \in \mathbf{S}(M)$ then

(a) p induces a cut $\bar{C}_p$ of M where $\bar{C}_p = \langle C_{p,1}, C_{p,2}\rangle, C_{p,1} = \{a \in M : (a < x) \in p\}$ and $C_{p,2} = M \backslash C_{p,1}$

(b) now $\bar{C}_p$ has a pair (κ_1, κ_2) of cofinalities $\kappa_1 = \mathrm{cf}(C_{p,1}, <_M), \kappa_2 = \mathrm{cf}(C_{p,2}, >_M)$ and $\max\{\kappa_1, \kappa_2\} \geq \kappa$

(c) now p does not split over some subset B of M of cardinality $\leq \lambda < \kappa$ iff $\min\{\kappa_1, \kappa_2\} \leq \lambda$

(*d*) for every $B \subseteq M$ of cardinality $< \min\{\kappa_1, \kappa_2\}$ for some $\varphi(x, \bar a) \in p$ we have $\varphi(x, \bar a) \vdash p \restriction B$ (i.e. p under $\vdash$ is $\min\{\kappa_1, \kappa_2\}$-directed) iff $\min\{\kappa_1, \kappa_2\} \geq \lambda$

(*e*) so for $\kappa = \min\{\kappa_1, \kappa_2\}$ we have a decomposition which is trivial in some sense: either we have $\bar c = <>$ or we have $\bar d = \bar c$

(*f*) if e.g. $\kappa_1 < \kappa_2$ and B_2 is an unbounded subset of $C_{p,1}$ of cardinality κ_1 and c, d realize in $\mathfrak{C}$ (where $M \prec \mathfrak{C}$) the type p and $\mathfrak{C} \models c < d$, then $\mathrm{tp}(c, M)$ is finitely satisfiable in B and for every $A \subseteq M$ of cardinality $< \kappa_2$ for some formula $\varphi(x, \bar a) \in p$ we have $\varphi(x, \bar a) \wedge (c < x) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(d, A \cup \{c\})$.

Discussion 2.17. 1) Note: if T is stable and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{mxK}_{\kappa,\theta}$ is normal then $\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}} \subseteq \mathrm{dcl}(\mathrm{Rang}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}))$.

Claim 2.18. *0) In 2.14 if* $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > \theta + |T|$ then *we can choose* $\psi = \psi(\bar x, \bar y', \bar z')$ *such that it depends on* $\mathbf{x}, \bar d, \varphi(\bar x, \bar y, \bar z)$ *but not on* B'.
0A) If $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > 2^{\theta + |T|}$ then *we can fix also* $q = \mathrm{tp}(\bar e, C_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}})$. *If* $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > 2^{\theta + |T| + |B_{\mathbf{x}}|}$ *then we can fix* $q = \mathrm{tp}(\bar e, B_{\mathbf{x}} \cup C_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \bar d_{\mathbf{x}})$.
1) Assume that $\mathbf{x} \in K_0$ *and* $\varphi = \varphi(\bar x, \bar y, \bar z) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_T)$ *are such that* $\bar y, \bar z$ *are finite and* $\ell g(\bar x) = \ell g(\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}})$.

Then *the following set is finite:* $J = J_{\mathbf{x},\varphi} = \{t \in I_{\mathbf{x}}$: *there are* $\bar\alpha = \langle \alpha_\ell : \ell < \ell g(\bar y)\rangle$ *and a sequence* $\bar b \in {}^{\ell g(\bar y)}(A_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \{\bar c_{\mathbf{x},s} : s \in I_{\mathbf{x}} \backslash \{t\}\})$ *such that* $\alpha_\ell \leq \ell g(\bar c_{\mathbf{x},t,0})$ *and* $\mathfrak{C} \models \varphi[\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}}, \langle (\bar c_{\mathbf{x},t,0})_{\alpha_\ell} : \ell < \ell g(\bar y)\rangle, \bar b] \wedge \neg\varphi[\bar d_{\mathbf{x}}, \langle (\bar c_{\mathbf{x},t,1})_{\alpha_\ell} : \ell < \ell g(\bar y)\rangle, \bar b)]\}$.
2) Moreover, the bound depends just on φ *and* T.
3) For any $\mathbf{x} \in K_{<\aleph_0,<\aleph_0}$ *and* φ *there is* $\mathbf{y}$ *satisfying* $\mathbf{x} \leq_1 \mathbf{y} \in K_{<\aleph_0,<\aleph_0}$ *such that* $I_{\mathbf{y}} \backslash I_{\mathbf{x}}$ *is finite and the local version of maximality holds, i.e.*

$$\mathbf{y} \leq_1 \mathbf{z} \in K_{<\aleph_0,<\aleph_0} \Rightarrow J_{\mathbf{z},\varphi} = J_{\mathbf{y},\varphi}.$$

4) For any $\mathbf{x} \in K_{<\aleph_0,<\aleph_0}$ *and sequence* $\langle \varphi_n : n < \omega\rangle$ *we can find* $\langle \mathbf{x}_n : n < \omega\rangle$ *such that* $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_n \leq_1 \mathbf{x}_{n+1} \in K_{<\aleph_0,<\aleph_0}, I_{\mathbf{x}_n} \backslash I_{\mathbf{x}}$ *finite and* $\mathbf{x}_{n+1}, \varphi_n$ *satisfies the demands on* $\mathbf{y}, \varphi$ *above for every* n.

Proof. 0) As there are $\leq \theta + |T| < \mathrm{cf}(\kappa)$ possible choices of φ and the set of possible B's is $(\mathrm{cf}(\kappa))$-directed.
0A) Similarly.
1),2) Let n_1 be minimal such that: for no $\bar b_\ell \in {}^{\ell g(\bar y)}\mathfrak{C}, \bar c_\ell \in {}^{\ell g(\bar z)}\mathfrak{C}$ for $\ell < n_1$ is $\langle \varphi(\bar x, \bar b_\ell, \bar c_\ell) : \ell < n_1\rangle$ an independent sequence of formulas. Let n_2 be minimal such that if $u_i \in [n_2 \backslash \{i\}]^{\ell g(\bar z)}$ for $i < n_2$ then for some $v \in [n_2]^{n_1}$ we have $i, j \in v \Rightarrow i \notin u_j$ (the finite Δ-system lemma). Now n_2 is a bound as required by the proof of 2.10.
3),4) Follows. $\square_{2.18}$

On strongly/strongly^2 dependent theories see [Sh:863].

Claim 2.19. *1) If* T *is strongly dependent* then *in the previous claim 2.18(1), if* $\mathbf{x}$ *satisfies* $t \in I_{\mathbf{x}} \Rightarrow n_t = \omega$ then *for each* $n < \omega$ *even the set* $\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{x}} = \cup\{\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{x},\varphi} : \varphi(\bar x, \bar y, \bar z) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_T)$ *as there and* $\ell g(\bar z) < n\}$ *is finite.*
2) If Y *is strongly dependent*^{2} then *above we can allow* $n = \omega$.

Proof. Similar. $\square_{2.19}$

* * *

We now turn to exact saturation.

Proof. Proof of 2.2,The Singular exact saturation theorem

Let $\theta = |T|$. As M is not κ^+-saturated, there are $A \subseteq M$ of cardinality $\leq \kappa$ and $p \in \mathbf{S}^1(A)$ omitted by M. Let $d \in \mathfrak{C}$ realize p. So let $\bar{c}$ be as in 2.3, so $\text{tp}(\bar{c}, M)$ does not split over some $N \prec M$ of cardinality $< \kappa$. Let $\langle B_i : i < \text{cf}(\kappa)\rangle$ be a $\subseteq$-increasing sequence of sets with union $N \cup A$ such that $i < \text{cf}(\kappa) \Rightarrow |B_i| < \kappa$ and $N \subseteq B_0$. Now we choose $A_i \subseteq M$ by induction on $i < \text{cf}(\kappa)$ such that A_i is of cardinality $\leq \theta$ and $\text{tp}(d, A_i \cup \bar{\mathbf{c}}) \vdash \text{tp}(d, B^+_i)$ where $B^+_i := B_i \cup \bigcup\{A_j : j < i\}$.

The choice is possible as $|B^+_i| < \kappa$ by 2.3, i.e. by the choice of $\bar{\mathbf{c}}$. Next we can find $A_\kappa \subseteq M$ of cardinality $\leq \theta$ such that $\text{tp}(d, A \cup \bar{\mathbf{c}}) \vdash \text{tp}(d, \bigcup\limits_{i<\kappa} A_i)$,possible as $|\bigcup\limits_{i<\text{cf}(\kappa)} A_i| \leq \theta + \text{cf}(\kappa) < \kappa$. Let $B^+ = \cup\{B^+_i : i < \text{cf}(\kappa)\} \cup A_\kappa$ so $|B^+| = \kappa$ and we ask the question:

⊙ is there an elementary mapping f (or automorphism of $\mathfrak{C}$) such that $f \restriction B^+$ is the identity and $f(\bar{\mathbf{c}}) \in {}^\theta M$?

If yes, then let $d' \in M$ realize $f(\text{tp}(d, A \cup \bar{\mathbf{c}})) \in \mathbf{S}(A \cup f(\bar{\mathbf{c}}))$ hence easily for each $i < \text{cf}(\kappa)$ the element d' realizes $f(\text{tp}(d, A_i))$ hence $f(\text{tp}(d, B^+_i)))$ but as B^+_i increases with i it realizes $f(\text{tp}(d, \cup\{B^+_i : i < \text{cf}(\kappa)\})$, hence it realizes $\text{tp}(d, A)$, but $d' \in M$ contradicting the choice of p, A, d.

So the answer to the question is no, which gives clauses (a),(b) of the desired conclusion. As for clause (c), we choose $\bar{c}_\varepsilon$ by induction on $\varepsilon < \kappa$

$(*)$ (a) $\bar{c}_\varepsilon \in {}^\theta M$

(b) $\bar{c}_\varepsilon$ realizes $\text{tp}(\bar{c}, \cup\{\bar{c}_\zeta : \zeta < \varepsilon\} \cup N)$

(c) if possible $\bar{c}_\varepsilon$ does not realize $\text{tp}(\bar{c}, N \cup B)$ hence for some $\alpha = \alpha_\varepsilon < \text{cf}(\kappa), \bar{c}_\varepsilon$ does not realize $\text{tp}(\bar{c}, B_\alpha)$

(d) if α_ε is well defined, it is minimal.

There is no problem to carrying the induction, by 1.1(2) the sequence $\bar{c}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \leq \kappa\rangle$ is indiscernible over N and easily is as required.

(The "moreover, there is an ultrafilter $\mathcal{D}$ on N" follows. $\square_{2.2}$

We may have hoped that 2.2 characterize being dependent, but this is not so. Clarification when this property (characterization of exctly κ-saturated $\kappa > \text{cf}(\kappa) > |T|$, as in 2.2) holds is given by

Example 2.20. 1) There is an independent T such that: if T has an exactly κ-saturated model then κ is regular. In fact, there is a sufficient condition.
2) The same holds for exactly κ-compact, $\kappa > \aleph_0$.

Proof. We use T which satisfies "Chang trick" from his proof of his two cardinal theorem $(\aleph_1, \aleph_0) \to (\lambda^+, \lambda)$ when $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$.

The condition is:

- $\circledast$ for some predicate $R(x,y) \in \tau_T$ written xRy (or just a formula $\varphi_*(x,y) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_T)$) we have [12]:
  - (a) the empty set can be coded, that is $\exists y \forall x(\neg xRy)$
  - (b) we can add to a coded set one element, that is $(\forall x,y)(\exists y_1)(\forall x_1)[x_1 R y_1 \equiv (x_1 R y \vee x_1 = x)]$.

Note: for any model M, if $R \notin \tau_M, M$ an infinite model, let $\langle u_b : b \in M \rangle$ list the finite subsets of M; expand M to M^+ by choosing $R^{\mu^+} = \{(a,b) : a \in u_b$ and $b \in M\}$, then $\mathrm{Th}(M^+)$ is as required.

So assume $\kappa = \Sigma\{\kappa_i : i < \mathrm{cf}(\kappa)\}, \kappa_i < \kappa_j < \kappa$ for $i < j < \mathrm{cf}(\kappa)$, $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) < \kappa$ and M is κ-saturated. Let $A \subseteq M, |A| = \kappa$ and $p \in \mathbf{S}(A,M)$. Let $A = \cup\{A_i : i < \mathrm{cf}(\kappa)\}, |A_i| \le \kappa_i, A_i$ increases with i. Let c_i realize $p \restriction A_i$.

By induction on i, we choose $b_i \in M$ which realizes the type

$$\begin{aligned} p_i(y) = \{c_j R y : j < \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) \text{ and } j \ge i\} \quad & \cup\{(\forall x)(xRy \to xRb_j) : j < i\} \\ & \cup\{(\forall x)(xRy \to \varphi(x,\bar a)) : \varphi(\bar x,\bar a) \in p \restriction A_i\}. \end{aligned}$$

By $\circledast$ and the induction hypothesis on $i, p_i(y)$ is finitely satisfiable in M.

[Why? Let $p'(y) \subseteq p_i(y)$ be finite so it has the form $\{c_j R y : j \in u\} \cup \{(\forall x)(xRy \to xRbj) : j \in v\} \cup \{(\forall x)(xRy \to \varphi_\ell(x,\bar a_\ell)) : \ell < n\}$ where $u \subseteq [i, \mathrm{cf}(\kappa))$ is finite, $v \subseteq i$ is finite and $\varphi_c(\bar x, \bar a_\ell) \in A_i$ for $\ell < n$. By $\circledast$ we can find $c \in M$ such that $M \models (\forall x)(xRc \equiv (\bigvee\limits_{j \in v} x = b_j)$, thus c realizes $p'(y))$].

But $|p_i| < \kappa$ so we can choose b_i.

Now $\{xRb_i : i < \mathrm{cf}(\kappa)\}$ is a finitely satisfiable set in M of formulas of cardinality $< \kappa$ and any element realizing it realizes p. $\square_{2.20}$

A weak complement to 2.3 is 2.22 but first recall

Definition 2.21. [T not necessarily dependent]
1) $\mathbf{I} \subseteq {}^\alpha\mathfrak{C}$ is a stable indiscernible set when: $\mathbf{I}$ is an infinite indiscernible set and $\mathrm{Av}(\mathbf{I},\mathfrak{C})$ is well defined, i.e. for any $\varphi(\bar x,\bar y), \ell g(\bar x) = \alpha$ and $\bar b \in {}^{\ell g(\bar y)}\mathfrak{C}$ either $\varphi(\mathbf{I},\bar b)$ or $\neg\varphi(\mathbf{I},\bar b)$ is finite.
2) $\mathbf{I}$ is a dependent indiscernible sequence when: $\mathbf{I} = \langle \bar a_t : t \in I\rangle, I$ is a linear order and for every formula $\varphi(\bar x,\bar b), \ell g(\bar x) = \ell g(\bar a_t)$, there is a convex equivalent relation E on I with finitely many equivalence classes such that $sEt \Rightarrow \varphi[\bar a_t,\bar b] \equiv \varphi[\bar a_s,\bar b]$.
3) In parts (1),(2) the conclusion holds for T if the assumption holds for T^{eq}.

Claim 2.22. *0) If T is dependent, $\mathbf{I} \subseteq {}^\alpha\mathfrak{C}$ is a stable indiscernible set iff $\mathbf{I}$ is an infinite indiscernible set.*
1) Assume (T is dependent and) there is an infinite indiscernible set $\mathbf{I} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$. If $\kappa^+ = 2^\kappa, \kappa > |T|$ then T has an exactly κ-saturated model.
2) Assume (T not necessarily dependent), $\mathbf{I} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$ is a stable indiscernible set. Then the conclusion of part (1) holds.

Remark 2.23. 1) Of course, trivially if for some non-zero ordinal α there is an infinite indiscernible set $\mathbf{I} \subseteq {}^\alpha\mathfrak{C}$ then for some $i < \alpha, \{(\bar a)_i : \bar a \in \mathbf{I}\}$ is an infinite indiscernible set.

---

[12] instead (a)+(b) we can have
$(a)'$ $\quad (\forall x_0,\dots,x_{n-1})(\forall z)(zRy = \bigvee\limits_{\ell<n} z = x_\ell)$ for every n.

2) But we could use below indiscernible set $\mathbf{I} \subseteq {}^\alpha\mathfrak{C}$.
3) On indiscernible sets for T dependent see [Sh:715, §1], we use it freely.
4) Of course: if $\{\bar a_t : t \in I\} \subseteq {}^\alpha\mathfrak{C}$ is an infinite indiscernble set/a stable indiscernible set, $u \subseteq \alpha$ and $\langle \bar a_t \restriction u : t \in I\rangle$ is not constant then $\{\bar a_t \restriction u : t \in I\} \subseteq {}^u\mathfrak{C}$ is an infinite indiscernible set/a stable indiscernible set. So using singletons in 2.22 is not a loss.
5) If I is a linear order and $I_1, I_2 \subseteq I$ are infinite, $\bar a_t \in {}^\beta\mathfrak{C}$ for $t \in I$ and $\mathbf{I} = \langle \bar a_\gamma : t \in I\rangle$ is an indiscernible sequence then $\mathbf{I} \restriction I_1$ is stable iff $\mathbf{I} \restriction I_2$ is stable.
This is easy.

Proof. 0) By [Sh:715, 1.28].
1) By part (2) recalling part (0).
2) Let $\mathbf{I} = \{a_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$ be an infinite stable indiscernible set. Now easily

$\odot_1$ for any $\bar b \in {}^{\omega>}\mathfrak{C}$ for some $\mathbf{J} \in [\mathbf{I}]^{\le |T|}$, the set $\mathbf{I}\backslash\mathbf{J}$ is an indiscernible set over $\bar b \cup \mathbf{J}$.

[Why? By the definition. First prove that for some finite J_φ we have $\models \varphi[\bar a_{t_0}, \dots, \bar a_{t_{n-1}}\bar b] = \varphi[\bar a_{s_0}, \dots, a_{s_n}, \bar b]$ when $t_0, \dots, t_{n-1}, s_0, \dots, s_n \in I\backslash J_\psi$ with no repetitions. Then use transitivity of equivalence.]

$\odot_2$ the following conditions on $\bar b \in {}^{\omega>}\mathfrak{C}$ are equivalent:
  (a) $\mathrm{tp}(\bar b, \mathbf{I})$, $\mathrm{Av}(\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{I})$ are weakly orthogonal
  (b) for some $\mathbf{J} \in [\mathbf{I}]^{\le |T|}$ we have $\mathrm{tp}(\bar b, \mathbf{J}) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(\bar b, \mathbf{I})$.

[Why? Check.]

$\odot_3$ let $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{D}_\mathbf{I} = \{p \in \mathbf{S}^{<\omega}(\mathbf{I}) : p$ weakly orthogonal to $\mathrm{Av}(\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{I})\}$.

We define

$\odot_4$ we say A is a $\mathbf{D}$-set if $\bar a \in {}^{\omega>}A \Rightarrow \mathrm{tp}(\bar a, \mathbf{I}) \in \mathbf{D}_\mathbf{I}$
$\odot_5$ if $\mathbf{I} \subseteq A$ we let $\mathbf{S}^m_\mathbf{D}(A) = \{\mathrm{tp}(\bar b, A) : A \cup \bar b$ is a $\mathbf{D}$-set and $\ell g(\bar b) = m\}$.

We note

$\odot_6$ if A is a $\mathbf{D}$-set and $\mathbf{I} \subseteq A$ then $\mathrm{Av}(\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{I}) \vdash \mathrm{Av}(\mathbf{I}, A)$; hence
  (a) if $A = |M|$, then M is not κ^+-saturated
  (b) A is a $\mathbf{D}$-set iff $A \cup \mathbf{I}$ is a $\mathbf{D}$-set.

By $\odot_2$

$\odot_7$ if A is a $\mathbf{D}$-set of cardinality $< \kappa$ and $p \in \mathbf{S}^m_\mathbf{D}(A \cup \mathbf{I})$ then for some $\mathbf{J} \subseteq \mathbf{I}$ of cardinality $\le |A| + |T|$ we have $p \restriction (A \cup \mathbf{J}) \vdash p$
$\odot_8$ if $\langle A_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\rangle$ is an $\subseteq$-increasing sequence of $\mathbf{D}$-sets, then $A_\delta := \cup\{A_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\}$ is a $\mathbf{D}$-set.

[Why? By the definition of a $\mathbf{D}$-set.]

$\odot_9$ if $\langle A_\alpha : \alpha \le \delta\rangle$ is $\subseteq$-increasing continuous, $\mathbf{I} \subseteq A_\delta$ and $p \in \mathbf{S}^m(A_\delta)$ then $p \in \mathbf{S}^m_\mathbf{D}(A_\delta) \Leftrightarrow \bigwedge\limits_{\alpha<\delta} p \restriction A_\alpha \in \mathbf{S}^m_\mathbf{D}(A_\alpha)$.

[Why? By the definition of $\mathbf{S}^m_\mathbf{D}(-)$ and $\odot_8$.]

Now comes a major point

$\odot_{10}$ if $A \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$ and $|A| < \kappa$ then we can find $\mathbf{I}_1$ such that: $\mathbf{I}_1$ is an indiscernible set, $\mathbf{I} \subseteq \mathbf{I}_1, |\mathbf{I}_1 \backslash \mathbf{I}| \le |T| + |A|$ and A is a $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{I}_1}$-set.

[Why? Let $\theta = |A| + |T|$ and we try by induction on $\alpha < \theta^+$ to choose an element a_α of $\mathfrak{C}$ which realizes $\mathrm{Av}(\mathbf{I}, \{a_\beta : \beta < \alpha\} \cup \mathbf{I})$ but does not realize $\mathrm{Av}(\mathbf{I}, \cup\{a_\beta : \beta < \alpha\} \cup A \cup \mathbf{I})$. But if we succeed to carry the induction clearly $\mathbf{I}^+ := \mathbf{I} \cup \{a_\alpha : \alpha < \theta^+\}$ is an indiscernible set, and a stable one (recalling 2.23(5)) hence for some $\mathbf{J} \subseteq \mathbf{I}^+$ of cardinality $\le |A| + |T|$, also $\mathbf{I}^+ \backslash \mathbf{J}$ is an indiscernible set over $A \cup \mathbf{J}$, but necessarily $\mathbf{J} \subseteq \mathbf{I} \cup \{a_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ for some $\alpha < \theta^+$, easy contradiction to the choice of a_α.]

$\odot_{11}$ if $A_1 \subseteq A_2$ are $\mathbf{D}_\mathbf{I}$-sets, $|A_2| \le \kappa, |A_1| < \kappa$ and $p \in \mathbf{S}^m_\mathbf{D}(A_1 \cup \mathbf{I})$ then there is $q \in \mathbf{S}^m_\mathbf{D}(A_2 \cup \mathbf{I})$ extending p.

[Why $\odot_{11}$? By $\odot_9$ without loss of generality $A_2 = A_1 \cup \{b\}$, so $|A_2| < \kappa$. We can find $\bar{c}$ realizing $p(\bar{y})$ and let $A = A_1 \cup \{b\} \cup \bar{c} = A_2 \cup \bar{c}$. So by $\odot_{10}$ there is $\mathbf{I}^+$ such that: $\mathbf{I}^+$ is an indiscernible set, $\mathbf{I} \subseteq \mathbf{I}^+, |\mathbf{I}^+ \backslash \mathbf{I}| \le \theta := |A| + |T| = |A_1| + |T| < \kappa$ and A is a $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{I}^+}$-set. As A_2 is a $\mathbf{D}_\mathbf{I}$-set we can find $\mathbf{J}_1 \subseteq \mathbf{I}$ of cardinality $\le |A_2| + |T| \le \theta < \kappa$ satisfying $\mathrm{tp}(A_2, \mathbf{J}_1) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(A_2, \mathbf{I})$. Also $A_1 \cup \bar{c}$ is a $\mathbf{D}_\mathbf{I}$-set (as A_1 is a $\mathbf{D}_\mathbf{I}$-set and $\bar{c}$ realizes $p(\bar{y}) \in \mathbf{S}^m_\mathbf{D}(A_1 \cup \mathbf{I})$) hence there is $\mathbf{J}_2 \subseteq \mathbf{I}$ of cardinality $\le |A_1 \cup \bar{c}| + |T| = \theta < \kappa$ such that $\mathrm{tp}(A_1 \cup \bar{c}, \mathbf{J}_1) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(A_1 \cup \bar{c}, \mathbf{I})$. Lastly, as A is a $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{I}^+}$-set there is $\mathbf{J}_3 \subseteq \mathbf{I}^+$ of cardinality $\le |A| + |T| = \theta$ such that $\mathrm{tp}(A, \mathbf{J}_3) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(A, \mathbf{I}^+)$.

As $\mathrm{tp}(A_2, \mathbf{J}_1) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(A_2, \mathbf{I})$ necessarily $\mathrm{tp}(A_2, \mathbf{J}_1) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(A_2, \mathbf{I}^+)$. Similarly $\mathrm{tp}(A_1 \cup \bar{c}, \mathbf{J}_2) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(A_2 \cup \bar{c}, \mathbf{I}^+)$. By cardinality considerations there is a permutation h of $\mathbf{I}^+$ which is the identity on $\mathbf{J}_1, \mathbf{J}_2$ and $\mathbf{J}_3 \cap \mathbf{I}$ and maps $\mathbf{J}_3 \backslash \mathbf{I}$ into $\mathbf{I}$. As $\mathbf{I}^+$ is an indiscernible set, h is an elementary mapping (of $\mathfrak{C}$). As $h \restriction \mathbf{J}_1$ is the identity and $\mathrm{tp}(A_2, \mathbf{J}_1) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(A_2, \mathbf{I}^+)$, see above also $h \cup \mathrm{id}_{A_2}$ is an elementary mapping hence there is an automorphism g of $\mathfrak{C}$ extending $h \cup \mathrm{id}_{A_2}$. As $\mathrm{tp}(A_1 \cup \bar{c}, \mathbf{J}_2) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(A_1 \cup \bar{c}, \mathbf{I}^+)$ and $h \restriction \mathbf{J}_2 = \mathrm{id}_{\mathbf{J}_2}, h \restriction A_1 = \mathrm{id}_{A_1}$ (recalling $A_1 \subseteq A_2$) and $h(\mathbf{I}^+) = \mathbf{I}^+$ necessarily $g(\bar{c})$ realizes $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}, A_1 \cup \mathbf{I}^+)$ hence it realizes $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}, A_1 \cup \mathbf{I})$ which is equal to $p(\bar{y})$. Also $\mathrm{tp}(A_2 \cup \bar{c}, \mathbf{J}_3) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(A_2 \cup \bar{c}, \mathbf{I}^+)$ hence $\mathrm{tp}(A_2 \cup g(\bar{c}), h(\mathbf{J}_3)) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(A_2 \cup h(\bar{c}), \mathbf{I}^+)$ hence $\mathrm{tp}(A_2 \cup g(\bar{c}), h(\mathbf{J}_3)) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(A_2 \cup g(\bar{c}), \mathbf{I})$, but $h(\mathbf{J}_3) \subseteq \mathbf{I}$. So $A_2 \cup g(\bar{c})$ is a $\mathbf{D}_\mathbf{I}$-set hence $q(\bar{y}) =: \mathrm{tp}(g(\bar{c}), A_2 \cup \mathbf{I})$ belongs to $\mathbf{S}^m_{\mathbf{D}_\mathbf{I}}(A_2 \cup \mathbf{I})$ so is as required.]

As $2^\kappa = \kappa^+$, by $\odot_9 + \odot_{11}$ there is $M \supseteq \mathbf{I}$ of cardinality κ^+ which is κ-saturated and is a $\mathbf{D}$-set hence by $\odot_6$ is not κ^+-saturated. $\square_{2.22}$

Observation 2.24. (Any complete first order T)

In $\mathfrak{C}$ there is no infinite indiscernible set iff for some n and $\varphi = \varphi(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_T), \varphi$ is connected and anti-symmetric (i.e. if $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in \mathfrak{C}$ with no repetitions then for some permutations π_1, π_2 of $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$ we have

$$\mathfrak{C} \models \varphi[a_{\pi_1(0)}, \dots, a_{\pi_1(n-1)}] \wedge \neg\varphi[a_{\pi_2(a)}, \dots, a_{\pi_2(a_{n-1})}].$$

Remark 2.25. 1) The second condition is related to (E) of Eherenfeuct [Ehr57] which says that the condition holds for some infinite set.

2) Note that $\mathfrak{C}$ may have no infinite indiscernible set but $\mathfrak{C}^{\mathrm{eq}}$ has.

Proof. The implication $\Leftarrow$ is obvious.

So assume the first statement. For $\alpha \le \omega$ and $\Delta \subseteq \Delta_* := \{\varphi(\bar{x}) : \varphi \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_T), \bar{x} = \langle x_\ell : \ell < n \rangle\}$ let $\Gamma^\alpha_\Delta = \{y_k \ne y_\ell : k < \ell < \alpha\} \cup \{\varphi(y_{k_0}, \dots, y_{k_{n-1}}) \equiv \varphi(x_{\ell_0}, \dots, x_{\ell_{n-1}}) : n < \alpha, \varphi(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{L}(\tau_T)$ and $k_0, \dots, k_{n-1} < \alpha$ without repetitions and $\ell_0, \dots, \ell_{n-1} < \alpha$ without repetitions$\}$. Easily $\Gamma^\omega_{\Delta_*}$ is not realized in $\mathfrak{C}$ by the present assumption and $\langle \Gamma^k_\Delta : \Delta$ is a finite subset of Δ_* and $k < \omega\rangle$ is $\subseteq$-increasing with k and Δ with union $\Gamma^\omega_{\Delta_*}$. Hence for some finite $\Delta \subseteq \Delta_*$ and $k < \omega$, the set Γ^k_Δ is not realized in $\mathfrak{C}$.

Let $\langle \varphi_i(x_0, \dots, x_{n_i - 1}) : i < i(*)\rangle$ list Δ so $i(*) < \omega$, so without loss of generality $n_i < k$ for $i < i(*)$. Lastly, we define $\varphi(y_0, \dots, y_{k-1})$, it says: if $\langle y_\ell : \ell < k\rangle$ is without repetitions and i is minimal such that $\langle y_\ell : \ell < k\rangle$ is not an $\{\varphi_i(x_0, \dots, x_{n_i-1})\}$-indiscernible set then $\varphi_i(y_0, \dots, y_{n_i-1})$. Now check. $\square_{2.24}$

Question 2.26. Is there a dependent T such that even in $\mathfrak{C}^{\rm eq}$ there is no infinite indiscernible set but some singular κ of cofinality $> |T|$ there is an exactly κ-saturated model of T?
2) For a dependent theory T characterize $\{\kappa : \kappa$ singular and T has exactly κ-saturated models$\}$.

Probably better to at least initially restrict ourselves to κ strong limit of large enough cardinality such that $2^\kappa = \kappa^+$.

* * *

The following in a sense gives a spectrum for $\bar{\mathbf{d}}/M$.

Claim 2.27. *For $\theta \ge |T|$, a model M and sequence $\bar{\mathbf{d}} \in {}^{\theta\ge}\mathfrak{C}$, there is a set Θ such that:*

(a) $\Theta \subseteq \Theta_* := \{\kappa : \kappa > \theta$ *and* M *is* κ*-saturated*$\}$

(b) $|\Theta| \le \theta$

(c) *if* $\kappa \in \Theta$ *and* $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > \theta$ *then there is* $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{mxK}_{\kappa,\le\theta}$ *such that* $M_{\mathbf{x}} = M, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}} = \bar{\mathbf{d}}$ *and* $|B_{\mathbf{x}}| \le \theta + \sup(\Theta \cap \kappa)$

(d) *if* $\theta < \kappa \in \Theta$ *and* $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) \le \theta$ *then* $\sup(\Theta \cap \kappa) = \kappa$.

Proof. Straight.

For each $\kappa \in \Theta' := \{\kappa' \in \Theta_i : \kappa'$ of cofinality $> \theta\}$ we can find $\mathbf{x}_\kappa \in \mathrm{mxK}_{\kappa,\le\theta}$ such that $M_{\mathbf{x}} = M, \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}} = \bar{\mathbf{d}}$ and for $\kappa \in \Theta_* \backslash \Theta'$ let $\odot_\kappa$ be a cofinal subset of κ of cardinality $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) \le \theta$. Let $f : \Theta' \to \mathrm{Card}$ be defined by $f(\kappa) = |B_{\mathbf{x}}| + \theta$. Note that Θ' has a maximal member or Θ' has a cofinal subset of cardinality $\le \theta$. Now choose Θ_n by induction on n such that $\Theta_n \subseteq \Theta_*, |\Theta_n| \le \theta$ and $n = m+1 \Rightarrow \Theta_m \subseteq \Theta_n$. Let Θ_0 be a cofinal subset of Θ of cardinality $\le \theta$, see above why possible. If $n = m+1$, let $\Theta_n = \{f(\kappa) : \kappa \in \Theta_m \cap \Theta'\} \cup \{\Theta_\kappa : \kappa \in \Theta_m \backslash \Theta'\} \cup \Theta_m$. Now $\cup\{\Theta_n : n < \omega\}$ is as required. $\square_{2.27}$

Discussion 2.28. Note that $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}}$ in 2.3 is κ-directed, but in general it is not definable in $M_{\mathbf{x}}$ and even not definable $(M_{\mathbf{x}})_{[\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}]}$ (or $M_{[B_{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{x}}]}$) by disjunction of types as it depends on $\bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}}$. So we may consider $\mathbf{P}'_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{P}_{M, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}, \alpha_{\mathbf{x}}} = \{p : q \in \mathbf{S}^{\alpha(\mathbf{x})}(A \cup \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}})$ and $A \subseteq M$ has cardinality $< \kappa\}$ ordered as before. Now $\mathbf{P}'_{\mathbf{x}}$ is partially ordered but it is not clear that it is κ-directed. Moreover $(M_{\mathbf{x}})_{[\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}]}$ is not κ-saturated, but is $(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{x}}, \kappa)$- sequence homogeneous for suitable $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is a good diagram (see [Sh:3]). So we can consider the families of such $\mathbf{D}$'s, fixing (T and) θ, varying.

But we can define the order in the κ-saturated $(M_{\mathbf{x}})_{[B_{\mathbf{x}}]}$ which is $\mathbb{L}_{\infty,\kappa}(\tau_T)$-equivalent to $\mathfrak{C}_{[B_{\mathbf{x}}]}$. In this model we have $\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \mathbb{L}_{\infty,\kappa}$ which is a partial order on the θ-tuples, $\ell g(\bar{x}) = \alpha_{\mathbf{x}} = \ell g(\bar{y})$.

However, in our case we know more. Letting $\Gamma = \mathbb{L}(\tau_T)$, if $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > \theta \geq |T|$ we know that we can find $\bar\psi = \langle \psi_\varphi(\bar x_\varphi, \bar y_\varphi, \bar z_\varphi) : \varphi \in \Gamma \rangle$ and the order on the set of $\bar{\mathbf{e}} = (\ldots {}^\frown \bar e_\varphi {}^\frown \ldots)_\varphi$ such that in 2.13 we can choose $\psi = \psi_\varphi$ (easy, see 2.18(0)). If $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > 2^\theta$, we can fix there also the type of $\bar{\mathbf{e}}$ over $C_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{x}}$.

So

$(*)_1$ let $\mathbf{I} = \{\bar e : \bar e \text{ as above}\}$, so $\mathbf{I}$ is type-definable in $(M_{\mathbf{x}})_{[B_{\mathbf{x}}]}$

$(*)_2$ $p_{\bar{\mathbf{e}}} = \{\psi_\varphi(\bar x_\varphi, \bar{\mathbf{e}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_{\mathbf{x}}) : \varphi \in \Gamma\}$ for $\bar{\mathbf{e}} \in \mathbf{I}$

$(*)_3$ (a) $\leq_1$ defined by $\bar{\mathbf{e}}_1 \leq \bar{\mathbf{e}}_2$ if $p_{\bar{\mathbf{e}}_2} \vdash p'$ for some p' such that $p_{\bar{\mathbf{e}}_1} \subseteq p' \in \mathbf{S}(B_{\mathbf{x}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{e}}_1)$

(b) $\mathbf{R}$ is defined by $\mathbf{e}_1 R \mathbf{e}_2$ iff $\psi_\varphi(\bar x, \bar e_\varphi, \bar c) \vdash p' \cap \{\varphi(\bar x, \bar b, \bar c) : \bar b \subseteq \mathrm{Rang}(\bar{\mathbf{e}}_1 \cup B_{\mathbf{x}})\}$ for each $\varphi \in \Gamma$ where p' is as above.

There are other variants, we intend to return to this.

We now consider some variants.

Definition 2.29. 1) In Definition 2.5 we add and define $K_\ell, K^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$, etc., also for $\ell = 2, 3$ by replacing clause $(f)_1$ by $(f)_\ell$ where

$(f)_2$ if $\ell = 2$ then $\mathrm{tp}(\bar c_t, A \cup \{\bar c_{s,m} : s <_I t, m < n_s\})$ is finitely satisfiable in B

$(f)_3$ if $\ell = 3$ then for some endless indiscernible sequence $\bar{\mathbf{b}}_t = \langle \bar b_{t,r} : r \in J_t \rangle$ of sequences from B, the sequence $\bar c_{t,0}$ realizes [13] the type $\mathrm{Av}(A \cup \{\bar c_{s,m} : s <_I t, m < n_t\}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}_t)$.

2) We define $\mathrm{mxK}^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$ similarly.

Claim 2.30. *1)* $K_3 \subseteq K_2 \subseteq K_1$.
2) If $\ell \in \{2, 3\}$ *and* $\langle \mathbf{x}_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ *is* $\leq_1$*-increasing in* $K^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,<\theta}$; $\delta < \mathrm{cf}(\theta), \delta < \mathrm{cf}(\kappa)$ *then* $\mathbf{x}_\delta = \bigcup_{\alpha<\delta} \mathbf{x}_\alpha$ *defined as in 2.6 belong*$_\ell$ *to* $K^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,<\theta}$ *and is a* $\leq_1$*-lub of the sequence.*
3) If $\ell = 0, 1, 2, 3$ *and* $\bar{\mathbf{d}} \in {}^{\theta>}\mathfrak{C}$ *and* M *is* κ*-saturated,* $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) \geq \theta$ *then* $\mathbf{x} = (M, \emptyset, <>, \bar{\mathbf{d}}) \in K^\ell_{\kappa,<\theta}$.
4) Like 2.10 for $\ell = 2, 3$, *i.e.: if* $\mathrm{cf}(\theta) > |T|$, $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > \theta, \ell \leq 3$ *and* $\mathbf{x} \in K^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,<\theta}$ *then* [14] *for some* $\mathbf{y}$ *we have* $\mathbf{x} \leq_1 \mathbf{y} \in \mathrm{mxK}^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,<\theta}$; *so in* $\mathrm{tp}(\mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{x}}, M_{\mathbf{y}} + \mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{x}})$ *we can get* $\mathrm{tp}(\bar c, M)$ *is finitely satisfiable in* $M_{\mathbf{y}} + (C_{\mathbf{y}} \backslash C_{\mathbf{x}})$).
5) If $\mathbf{x} \in K_2$ *and* $\bar c \in C_{\mathbf{x}}$ *then* $\mathrm{tp}(\bar c, A_{\mathbf{x}})$ *is finitely satisfiable in* $B_{\mathbf{x}}$.

Claim 2.31. *1) In 2.12 we can deal with* $K^\ell_{\lambda,\kappa,<\theta}, \ell = 2, 3$, *i.e. if* $\ell = 2$ *we should strengthen the assumption to "*q *is finitely satisfiable in* B'*".*
2) If $\ell = 3$ *we should strengthen the assumption to* $q = \mathrm{Av}(M_{\mathbf{x}} \cup C_{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{I}), \mathbf{I}$ *an endless indiscernible sequence of cardinality* $< \kappa$.
3) In 2.13 we can deal with $\mathrm{mxK}^2_{\lambda,\kappa,\theta}$.

---

[13] we may consider "$\bar c_t$ realizes, seeming this makes no difference

[14] so if $\kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > \theta \geq |T|, M$ is κ-saturated and $\bar d \in {}^{\theta^+>}\mathfrak{C}$ then for some $\bar c \in {}^{\theta^+>}\mathfrak{C}$ and $B \in [M]^{<\kappa}$ we have $(M, B, \bar c, \bar d) \in \mathrm{mxK}_2$.

3. Existence of strict type decompositions

Hypothesis 3.1. 0) T is dependent, $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}_T$ a monster; we may add one of: (1) - (4).

(1) (a) $\lambda = \kappa$ is a measurable cardinal
  (b) $\mathcal{D}$ is a normal filter on $I = \lambda$, so I is a linear order
  (c) $M_\alpha \prec \mathfrak{C}$ is $\prec$-increasing, $\|M_\alpha\| < \lambda$
  (d) $M = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha<\lambda} M_\alpha$ is saturated
  (e) $\kappa_I(t) = t$ for $t \in I$

(2) (a) $\mathcal{D}$ is a fine normal ultrafilter on $[\lambda]^{<\kappa}$, so κ is a measurable cardinal $\leq \lambda$
  (b) I is the following partial order,
    (α) set of elements $[\lambda]^{<\kappa}$ and
    (β) $s \leq_I t$ iff $s \subseteq t \wedge |s| < |\kappa \cap t|$
  (c) $M_t \prec \mathfrak{C}, \|M_t\| < \kappa$ and $s <_I t \Rightarrow M_s \prec M_t$
  (d) $M = \cup\{M_t : t \in I\}$
  (e) $\kappa_I(t) =$ Min$(\kappa \backslash t)$
  (f) if $s <_I t$ then M_t is $\|M_s\|^+$-saturated

(3) like (2) without the normality

(4) $(a)(b), (c), (d)$ of part (2).

Remark 3.2. So in 3.1 we have (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) and (2) $\Rightarrow$ (4).

Definition 3.3. [under 3.1(1) or (2) or just see (4).]
1) For $\mathcal{U} \subseteq I$ (usually $\in \mathcal{D}$ or at least $\in \mathcal{D}^+$), so is a partial order, we say $\langle \bar{a}_t : t \in \mathcal{U}\rangle$ is indiscernible in M over A when:

(a) $\ell g(\bar{a}_t)$ is constant, $\bar{a}_t \subseteq M$ for $t \in \mathcal{U}$

(b) for each n for some p_n for every $t_0 <_I \ldots <_I t_{n-1}$ from $\mathcal{U}$ we have $\text{tp}(\bar{a}_{t_0}{}^\frown \ldots {}^\frown \bar{a}_{t_{n-1}}, A, M) = p_n$.

2) We say $\langle \bar{a}_t : t \in \mathcal{U}\rangle$ is fully indiscernible in M over A when (a),(b) and

(c) if $s <_I t$ are from $\mathcal{U}$ then $\bar{a}_s \subseteq M_t$

(d) if $s \in \mathcal{U}$ then [15] the sequence $\langle a_t : t \in \mathcal{U} \cap I_{\geq s}\rangle$ is indiscernible over $M_s \cup A$ where, of course, $I_{\geq s} := \{t \in I : s \leq_I t\}$.

3) In parts (1),(2) of the definition we say k-indiscernible when in clause (b) we demand $n \leq k$.

Claim 3.4. *[under 3.1(1) or (2) or just (4)]*
1) If $A \subseteq M, |A| < \kappa, \alpha < \kappa, \mathcal{U}_1 \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\bar{a}_t \in {}^\alpha M$ for $t \in \mathcal{U}_1$ then for some $\mathcal{U}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{U}_1$ from $\mathcal{D}$ the sequence $\langle \bar{a}_t : t \in \mathcal{U}_2\rangle$ is indisernible over A (in M).
2) In fact fully indiscernible.

Proof. By well known set theory (see Kanamori Magidor [KM78]). $\square_{3.4}$

---

[15] by normality (i.e. if (1) or (2) or (4) holds) then this follows

Claim 3.5. *Assume 3.1(1) or (2) and* $\kappa > \theta \ge |T|$ *so the* κ*-saturated* $M \prec \mathfrak{C}$ *is well defined and* $\lambda \ge \kappa$*. For every* $\gamma(*) < \theta^+$ *and* $\bar{d} \in {}^{\gamma(*)}\mathfrak{C}$ *there are* B *and* $\langle (\bar{c}^\omega_t, \bar{d}^\omega_t) : t \in \mathcal{U} \cup \{\lambda\}\rangle$ *such that:*

$\boxtimes$ (a) $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{D}$,
(b) $B \subseteq M, |B| < \kappa$,
(c) $\ell g(\bar{d}^\omega_t) = \gamma(*) + \theta\omega$,
(d) $\bar{d} \trianglelefteq \bar{d}^\omega_\lambda$,
(e) $\mathbf{x} = (M, B, \bar{c}^\omega_\lambda, \bar{d}^\omega_\lambda) \in \mathrm{mxK}_{\kappa,\theta}$,
(f) $\bar{c}^\omega_t \hat{}\, \bar{d}^\omega_t \subseteq M$ *realizes* $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}^\omega_\lambda \hat{}\, \bar{d}^\omega_\lambda, M_t)$ *for* $t \in \mathcal{U}$,
(g) $\langle \bar{c}^\omega_t \hat{}\, \bar{d}^\omega_t : t \in \mathcal{U}\rangle$ *is fully indiscernible in* M *over* B *and even over* $B \cup \bar{c}^\omega_\lambda \cup \bar{d}^\omega_\lambda$, *(see Definition 3.3),*
$(h)_1$ *if* $t_0 <_I \ldots <_I t_m <_I t_{m+1} \ldots <_I t_n$ *belongs to* $\mathcal{U}$ *then* $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}^\omega_{t_{m+1}}, \bar{c}^\omega_{t_{m+1}} + \bar{c}^\omega_{t_{m+2}} + \ldots + \bar{c}^\omega_{t_n} + \bar{d}^\omega_{t_m}) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}^\omega_{t_{m+1}}, \bar{c}^\omega_{t_0} + \ldots + \bar{c}_{t_{m+1}} + \ldots + \bar{c}^\omega_{t_n} + \bar{d}^\omega_{t_0} + \ldots + \bar{d}^\omega_{t_m} + M_{t_0})$,
$(h)_2$ *if* $s <_I t$ *are from* $\mathcal{U}$ *then* $\bar{c}^\omega_s \hat{}\, \bar{d}^\omega_s$ *is from* M_t, *(actually follows from clause (g))*
$(h)_3$ *if* $t_0 <_I \ldots <_I t_n$ *are from* $\mathcal{U}$ *then* $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}^\omega_{t_1}, \bar{d}^\omega_{t_0} + \bar{c}^\omega_{t_1}) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}^\omega_{t_1}, M_{t_0} + \bar{d}^\omega_{t_0} + \bar{c}^\omega_{t_0} + \bar{c}^\omega_{t_1} + \ldots + \bar{c}^\omega_{t_n})$,
we can add
(i) $\mathbf{x}$ *is normal, i.e.* $\mathrm{Rang}(\bar{c}_\omega) \subseteq \mathrm{Rang}(\bar{d}_\omega)$.

Proof. First by induction on n we choose $\bar{d}_n, \bar{c}_n, B_n, \langle (\bar{c}^n_t, \bar{d}^n_t) : t \in \mathcal{U}_n\rangle$ and if $n > 0$ also $\bar{e}_n, \bar{e}^n_t$ (for $t \in \mathcal{U}_n$) such that

$\circledast_n$ (a) $\bar{d}_n \in {}^{\gamma(*)+\theta n}\mathfrak{C}$ and $\bar{d}_0 = \bar{d}$
(b) $\mathbf{x}_n = (M, B_n, \bar{c}_n, \bar{d}_n) \in \mathrm{mxK}_{\kappa,\theta}$ is normal
(c) $\bar{d}_m \triangleleft \bar{d}_n$ if $m < n$
(d) $\bar{c}_m = \bar{c}_n \restriction I_{\mathbf{x}_m}$ if $m < n$
(e) $\bar{c}^n_t \hat{}\, \bar{d}^n_t$ is from M and realizes $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_n \hat{}\, \bar{d}_n, M_t)$ for $t \in \mathcal{U}_n$
(f) $\bar{d}_n = \bar{d}_m \hat{}\, \bar{e}_n$ and $\ell g(e_n) = \theta$ and $\mathbf{x}_m \le_0 \mathbf{x}_n$ if $n = m + 1$
(g) $\langle \bar{c}^n_t \hat{}\, \bar{d}^n_t : t \in \mathcal{U}_n\rangle$ is fully indiscernible over $B_n + \bar{c}_n + \bar{d}_n$
(h) $\mathcal{U}_n \in \mathcal{D}$ decrease with n,
(i) if $s < t$ are from $\mathcal{U}_n$ then $M_s + \bar{c}^n_s + \bar{d}^n_s \subseteq M_t$ (follows by (g))
(j) $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}_m, \bar{e}^n_t + \bar{c}_m) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}_m, M_t + \bar{c}_m + \bar{c}^m_t + \bar{d}^m_t)$ if $n = m + 1, t \in \mathcal{U}_n$
(k) $(M_t, B_n, \bar{c}_n, \bar{d}_n) \in \mathrm{mxK}_{\kappa_t,\theta}$ for $t \in \mathcal{U}_n$
(l) if $n = m + 1, k \le \omega$ and $t_0 <_I \ldots <_I t_k$ are from $\mathcal{U}_n$ then

$$\mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}^m_{t_1}, \bar{c}^m_{t_1} + \bar{e}^n_{t_0}) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}^m_{t_1}, \sum_{\ell=0}^{k} \bar{c}^m_{t_\ell} + \bar{d}^m_{t_0} + \bar{e}^n_{t_0} + M_{t_0}).$$

Case 1: $n = 0$.

First, let $\bar{d}_0 = \bar{d}$. Recalling 2.6(4) clearly $\mathbf{y}_n =: (M, \emptyset, <>, \bar{d}_0) \in K_{\kappa,\theta}$.

Second, by claim 2.10 we can find $B_n, \bar{c}_n$ such that $\mathbf{y}_n \le_1 \mathbf{x}_n := (M, B_n, \bar{c}_n, \bar{d}_n) \in \mathrm{mxK}_{\kappa,\theta}$.

Third, for $t \in I$ we can choose $\bar{c}^n_t \hat{}\, \bar{d}^n_t$ from M which realizes $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_n \hat{}\, \bar{d}_n, M_t)$.

Fourth, by 3.4 we choose $\mathcal{U}_0 \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\langle \bar{c}^n_t \hat{}\, \bar{d}^n_t : t \in \mathcal{U}_0 \rangle$ is a fully indiscernible sequence over B_0 and (by the normality of the filter $\mathcal{D}$) in particular $\bar{c}^n_s \hat{}\, \bar{d}^n_s \subseteq M_t$ when $s < t \in \mathcal{U}_0$ are from I. It is easy to check that all the demands hold.

Case 2: $n = m + 1$.

First, by clause (k) for m and claim 2.14 for each $t \in \mathcal{U}_m$ there is $\bar{e}^{n,*}_t \in {}^\theta M$ such that

$(*)_1$ $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}_m, \bar{c}_m + \bar{e}^{n,*}_t) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}_m, \bar{c}_m + M_t + \bar{c}^m_t + \bar{d}^m_t)$.

Second, by 3.4 choose $\mathcal{U}'_n \subseteq \mathcal{U}_m$ which belongs to $\mathcal{D}$ such that $\langle \bar{c}^m_t \hat{}\, \bar{d}^m_t \hat{}\, \bar{e}^{n,*}_t : t \in \mathcal{U}'_n \rangle$ is fully indiscernible over $B_m + \bar{c}_m + \bar{d}_m$.

We shall now prove

$\odot_1$ if $t_0 < \ldots < t_k$ are from $\mathcal{U}'_n$ then $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}_{t_1}, \bar{c}^m_{t_1} + \bar{e}^{n,*}_{t_0}) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}_{t_1}, \bar{c}^m_{t_1} + \ldots + \bar{c}^m_{t_k} + M_{t_0})$.

By clause (e) of $\circledast_m$ we have

$(*)_2$ $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}^m_{t_1} \hat{}\, \bar{d}^m_{t_1}, M_{t_1}) = \mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_m \hat{}\, \bar{d}_m, M_{t_1})$.

By $(*)_2$ there is an elementary mapping f mapping $\bar{c}_m \hat{}\, \bar{d}_m$ to $\bar{c}^m_{t_1} \hat{}\, \bar{d}^m_{t_1}$ which is the identity on M_{t_1}, but $M_{t_0} + \bar{c}^m_{t_0} + \bar{d}^m_{t_0} \subseteq M_{t_1}$ by $\circledast_m(i)$ and $\bar{e}^{n,*}_{t_0} \subseteq M_{t_1}$ by the full indiscernibility above hence by $(*)_1$ we get

$(*)_3$ $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}^m_{t_1}, \bar{c}^m_{t_1} + \bar{e}^{n,*}_{t_0}) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(d^m_{t_1}, M_{t_0} + \bar{c}^m_{t_1} + \bar{c}^m_{t_0} + \bar{d}^m_{t_0})$.

Now by clause (k) of $\circledast_m$

$(*)_4$ $(M_{t_0}, B_m, \bar{c}_m, \bar{d}_m) \in \mathrm{mxK}_{\kappa_I(t_0),\theta}$.

But by clause (e) of $\circledast_m$

$(*)_5$ $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}^m_{t_1} \hat{}\, \bar{d}^m_{t_1}, M_{t_0}) = \mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_m \hat{}\, \bar{d}_m, M_{t_0})$.

By $(*)_4 + (*)_5$

$(*)_6$ $(M_{t_0}, B_m, \bar{c}^m_{t_1}, \bar{d}^m_{t_1}) \in \mathrm{mxK}_{\kappa_I(t_0),\theta}$.

Also easily by clauses (k) + (i) of $\circledast_m$ applied to $t = t_2, t_3, \ldots, t_k$ (recalling 1.5(7))

$(*)_7$ $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}^m_{t_2} \hat{}\, \ldots \hat{}\, \bar{c}^m_{t_k}, M_{t_0} + \bar{c}^m_{t_1} + \bar{d}^m_{t_1})$ does not split over B_m.

By $(*)_6 + (*)_7$ and the weak orthogonality claim 2.12(1) we have

$(*)_8$ $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}^m_{t_1}, M_{t_0} + \bar{c}^m_{t_1}) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}^m_{t_1}, M_{t_0} + \bar{c}^m_{t_1} + \ldots + \bar{c}^m_{t_k})$.

By $(*)_3 + (*)_8$

$(*)_9$ $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}^m_{t_1}, \bar{c}^m_{t_1} + \bar{e}^{n,*}_{t_0}) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(d^m_{t_1}, M_{t_0} + \bar{c}^n_{t_1} + \ldots + \bar{c}^m_{t_k})$

as promised in $\odot_1$.

Now we continue to deal with Case 2, choose $F_n : \mathcal{U}'_n \to \mathcal{U}'_n$ such that $s \in \mathcal{U}'_n \Rightarrow s <_I F_n(s) \in \mathcal{U}'_n$ and for $t \in \mathcal{U}'_n$ we let $\bar{e}^n_t := \bar{e}^{n,*}_{F_n(t)}$. Let $\bar{e}_n$ be such that $\bar{c}_m \char`^ \bar{d}_m \char`^ \bar{e}_n$ realizes $\mathrm{Av}(\langle \bar{c}^m_t \char`^ \bar{d}^m_t \char`^ \bar{e}^n_t : t \in \mathcal{U}'_n \rangle / \mathcal{D}, M)$. Let $\mathcal{U}''_n \in \mathcal{D}$ be $\subseteq \mathcal{U}'_n$ and such that $s \in \mathcal{U}''_n \wedge t \in \mathcal{U}''_n \wedge s <_I t \Rightarrow F_n(s) <_I t$ and the sequence $\langle \bar{c}^m_t \char`^ \bar{d}^m_t \char`^ \bar{e}^n_{F(t)} : t \in \mathcal{U}''_n \rangle$ is fully indiscernible over $\bar{c}_n \char`^ \bar{d}_m \char`^ \bar{e}_n$.

Let $\bar{d}_n = \bar{d}_m \char`^ \bar{e}_n$ and $\bar{d}^n_t = \bar{d}^m_t \char`^ \bar{e}^n_t$ for $t \in \mathcal{U}''_n$.

Let $\mathbf{y}_n := (M, B_m, \bar{c}_m, \bar{d}_n) \in K_{\kappa,\theta}$ so clearly $\mathbf{x}_m \le_1 \mathbf{y}_n$ hence by 2.10 there is $\mathbf{x}_n = (M, B_n, \bar{c}_n, \bar{d}_n) \in \mathrm{mxK}_{\kappa,\theta}$ such that $\mathbf{y}_n \le_2 \mathbf{x}_n$ so $\bar{c}_n$ and B_n are well defined [16] and $\bar{c}_m = \bar{c}_n \restriction I_{\mathbf{x}_m}$. Let $\bar{c}^n_t$ be a sequence from M such that $\bar{c}^m_t = \bar{c}^n_t \restriction \mathrm{Dom}(\bar{c}_m)$ and $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}^n_t \char`^ \bar{d}^n_t, M_t) = \mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_n \char`^ \bar{d}_n, M_t)$ this is possible as M is κ-saturated, $|M_t + \bar{c}^m_t + \bar{d}^n_t| < \kappa, |\mathrm{Rang}(\bar{c}_n)| < \kappa$ and $\bar{c}^m_t \char`^ \bar{d}^n_t$ realizes the type $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_m \char`^ \bar{d}_n, M_t)$.

Lastly, let $\mathcal{U}_n$ be a subset of $\mathcal{U}''_n$ which belongs to $\mathcal{D}$ such that

$\odot_2$ $\langle \bar{c}^n_t \char`^ \bar{d}^n_t : t \in \mathcal{U}_n \rangle$ is fully indiscernible over $B_n + \bar{c}_n + \bar{d}_n$
$\odot_3$ $(M_t, B_n, \bar{c}_n, \bar{d}_n) \in \mathrm{mxK}_{\kappa,\theta}$ for every $t \in \mathcal{U}_n$.

[Why $\mathcal{U}_n$ exists? By 3.4 and 2.9.]

It is easy to check that $\mathbf{x}_n, \bar{c}_n, \bar{d}_n, \bar{d}_n, \langle (c^n_t, \bar{d}^n_t, \bar{e}^n_t) : t \in \mathcal{U}_n \rangle$ are as required. E.g. clause (f) holds as $\ell g(d_0) = \ell g(\bar{d}) = \gamma(*)$ and $\ell g(\bar{d}_m) = \gamma(*) + \theta m$ by clause (a) of $\circledast_m$ and $\ell g(\bar{e}_n) = \theta$ by $\circledast_n(f)$ we can prove that $\ell g(\bar{d}_n) = \ell g(\bar{d}_m) + \theta = \gamma(*) + \theta m + \theta = \gamma(*) + \theta n$, so we clearly are done.

So we can carry the induction. Let $\bar{c}_\omega = \bar{c}^\omega_\lambda = \bigcup\limits_{n<\omega} \bar{c}_n, \bar{d}_\omega = \bar{d}^\omega_t = \bigcup\limits_{n<\omega} \bar{d}^n_t$ and $B = \cup\{B_n : n < \omega\}$ and $\mathcal{U} = \cap\{\mathcal{U}_n : n < \omega\}$.
Let us check the conclusion, i.e. $\boxtimes$.

Clause (a): $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{D}$ as each $\mathcal{U}_n \in \mathcal{D}$ by $\circledast_n(h)$ and $\mathcal{D}$ is κ-complete and $\kappa > \aleph_0$.

Clause (b): $B \in [M]^{<\kappa}$ as $B_n \subseteq M, |B_n| < \kappa$ by $\circledast_n(b)$ for $n < \omega$ and κ is regular uncountable and $B := \cup\{B_n : n < \omega\}$.

Clause (c): By $\circledast_n(a) + (c)$ for $n < \omega$.

Clause (d): $\bar{d} = \bar{d}_0 = \bar{d}_\omega \restriction \gamma(*)$ is proved as in clause (c).

Clause (e): As $\mathbf{x}_n = (M, B_n, \bar{c}_n, \bar{d}_n) \in \mathrm{mxK}_{\kappa,\theta}$ by clause (b) of $\circledast_n$ and $\mathbf{x}_n \le_1 \mathbf{x}_{n+1}$ by $\circledast_{n+1}(f)$ and $(M, B, \bar{c}_\omega, \bar{d}_\omega) = \cup\{\mathbf{x}_n : n < \omega\}$, clearly by claim 2.12(2) we are done.

Clause (f): By clause (e) of $\circledast_n$ (and the choice of $\bar{c}_\omega, \bar{d}_\omega, \bar{c}^\omega_t, \bar{d}^\omega_t$, etc).

Clause (g): Similarly by clause (g) of $\circledast_n$.

Clause $(\mathrm{h})_1$: By clauses $(h)_2 + (h)_3$ proved below.

Clause $(\mathrm{h})_2$: By clause (i) of $\circledast$.

Clause $(\mathrm{h})_3$: Holds by clause (ℓ) of $\circledast_n$. $\square_{3.5}$

---

[16] in fact, we can demand that $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}_n \restriction (I_{\mathbf{x}_n} \backslash I_{\mathbf{x}_m}), M + \bar{c}_m)$ does not split over $B_{\mathbf{x}_n}$

So 3.5 proves the existence of:

Definition 3.6. 1) For an infinite linear order J we say $\langle(\bar{c}_t, \bar{d}_t) : t \in J\rangle$ is a strict $(\kappa, < \theta)$-decomposition over $(M, B), B \subseteq M$ when (and over M means "for some $B \subseteq M$ of cardinality $< \kappa$"):

(a) $M \prec \mathfrak{C}$ is κ-saturated, but if we write $< \aleph_0$ instead of κ we mean $M \prec \mathfrak{C}$ and if we write 0 instead of κ we replace M by a set $\supseteq B$

(b) $\alpha = \ell g(\bar{c}_t), \beta = \ell g(\bar{d}_t)$ are $< \theta$

(c) if $t_0 <_I \ldots <_I t_k$ then $\text{tp}(\bar{c}_{t_n}, M + \bar{c}_{t_0} \hat{}\, \bar{d}_{t_0} + \ldots + \bar{c}_{t_{n-1}} \hat{}\, d_{t_{n-1}})$ is increasing with n and does not split over B

(d) $\langle(\bar{c}_t \hat{}\, \bar{d}_t : t \in J\rangle$ is indiscernible over M

(e) if $s <_I t$ then $\text{tp}(\bar{d}_t, \bar{c}_t + \bar{d}_s) \vdash \ \text{tp}(\bar{d}_t, \cup\{\bar{c}_r \hat{}\, \bar{d}_r : r \leq s\} \cup \bigcup\{\bar{c}_r : r \in J\} \cup M)$

(f) for every $A \subseteq M$ of cardinality $< \kappa$ for some $\bar{c} \hat{}\, \bar{d} \in {}^{\alpha+\beta}M$, the sequence $\langle \bar{c} \hat{}\, \bar{d}\rangle \hat{}\, \langle \bar{c}_t \hat{}\, \bar{d}_t : t \in J\rangle$ is an indiscernible sequence over A, so if $\kappa = 0$ this is empty

2) If $\theta = \sigma^+$ instead of "$< \theta$" we may write σ. If $\kappa = 0$ then M is replaced by a set A, if we write $< \aleph_0$ instead of κ then M is just a model. We say strict$_{-1}$ (κ, θ)-decomposition if (in part (1)) we omit clauses (e) and (f).

We say strict$_0$ $(\kappa, < \theta)$-decomposition if we omit (f) and weaken (e) to (e)$^-$, strict may be written strict$_1$ where

$(e)^-$ if $s <_I t$ then $\text{tp}(\bar{d}_t, \bar{c}_t + \bar{d}_s) \vdash \ \text{tp}(\bar{d}_t, \cup\{\bar{c}_r \hat{}\, \bar{d}_r : r \leq s\} \cup \bar{c}_t \cup M)$.

Claim 3.7. *1) If $\lambda = \|M\|, \bar{d} \in {}^{\theta^+ >}\mathfrak{C}$ and the conclusion of claim 3.5 holds (e.g. if Hypothesis 3.1(1) or (2) holds) then we can find a strict (κ, θ)-decomposition $\langle(\bar{c}_n, \bar{d}_n) : n < \omega\rangle$ over M such that $\bar{d} \triangleleft \bar{d}_0$.*
2) Instead Hypothesis 3.1 it is enough to demand: if M is κ-saturated and $p = p(\langle x_i : i < \theta\rangle)$ is a type with parameters from $M \cup C, |C| \leq \theta$ which is $(< \kappa)$-satisfiable in M, i.e. every subset of p of cardinality $< \kappa$ is realized in M then p can be extended to $p^+ \in \mathbf{S}^\theta(M \cup C)$ which is $(< \kappa)$-satisfiable in M.

Proof. 1) Easy ($\ell g(\bar{d}) = \theta$ or $\ell g(\theta) < \theta^+$ does not matter).
2) The idea is to repeat the proof of 3.5, but as of unclear value we delay this. $\square_{3.7}$

Claim 3.8. *Assume $\kappa = \lambda > |T|$ is weakly compact, $M_\alpha \in \text{EC}_{<\lambda}(T)$ is $\prec$-increasing continuous, $M = \cup\{M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ is saturated. Then 3.5 and 3.9(2) hold.*

Proof. Revise the proof of 3.5, but in $\circledast$ weaken clauses (g) to (g)$^-$ and use the proof of 4.9 in the end where

$(g)^-$ $\mathcal{U}_n \in [\kappa]^\kappa$ decreasing with n and $\langle \bar{c}^n_t \hat{}\, \bar{d}^n_t : t \in \mathcal{U}_n\rangle$ is just fully n-indiscernible.

We shall give a full proof elsewhere. $\square_{3.8}$

Claim 3.9. *1) (no need of 3.1)*
Assume M is κ-saturated, $|T| \leq \theta < \kappa$, $\text{tp}(\bar{c}_n, M + \bar{c}_0 + \ldots + \bar{c}_{n-1})$ does not split over B where $|B| < \kappa, B \subseteq M$ and $\ell g(\bar{c}_n) < \theta^+$ and $\bar{d}_n = \bar{c}_n \restriction u$ for $n < \omega$ (so $u \subseteq \text{Dom}(\bar{c}_n)$) then $\langle(\bar{c}_n, \bar{d}_n) : n < \omega\rangle$ is a strict (κ, θ)-decomposition over (M, B).

2) (Rely on 3.1!) Assume $\langle(\bar c_n,\bar d_n) : n<\omega\rangle$ *is a strict* (κ,θ)*-decomposition over* (M,B). *For any* $\bar d\in {}^{\theta^+>}\mathfrak{C}$ *we can find a strict* (κ,θ)*-decomposition* $\langle(\bar c^+_n,\bar d^+_n) : n<\omega\rangle$ *over* M *such that* $\bar c_n\trianglelefteq\bar c^+_n,\bar d_n\trianglelefteq\bar d^+_n$ *for* $n<\omega$ *and* $\bar d_0\char`^\bar d\trianglelefteq\bar d^+_0$.

Remark 3.10. We can add (rely on 3.1):

If $\langle\bar d_n : n<\omega\rangle$ is an indiscernible sequence over M (so $\bar d_n\in {}^{\theta^+>}\mathfrak{C}$) such that for any $A\in[M]^{<\kappa}$ some $\bar d'\in M$ realizes $\mathrm{tp}(\bar d_0, A\cup\bigcup\{\bar d_{1+n} : n<\omega\})$ <u>then</u> we can find $\bar c_n\in {}^{\theta^+>}\mathfrak{C}$ for $n<\omega$ such that $\langle(\bar d_n,\bar c_n) : n<\omega\rangle$ is a strict (κ,θ)-decomposition.

Proof. 1) Easy.
2) Repeat the proof of 3.5 starting with $\mathbf{x}_0=(M,B,\bar c_0,\bar d_0)$ and $\langle\bar c_t\char`^\bar d_t : t\in I\rangle$ such that $\bar c_t\char`^ d_t\in {}^{\ell g(\bar c_t)+\ell g(\bar d_t)}M$ realizing $\mathrm{tp}(\bar c_0\char`^\bar d_0, M_t+\sum\limits_{n<\omega}\bar c_{1+n}\char`^\bar d_{1+n})$. $\square_{3.9}$

Claim 3.11. *The sequence* $\langle(\bar c^2_t,\bar d^2_t) : t\in I_2\rangle$ *is a strict*$_0$ $(0,\theta)$*-decomposition over* (B_2,B_1) *<u>when</u>*

- (a) $\langle(\bar c^1_s,\bar d^1_s) : s\in I_1)\rangle$ *is a strict*$_0$ $(0,\theta)$*-decomposition (and* $\ell g(\bar c^1_s)=\ell g(\bar c^2_t),\ell g(\bar d^1_s)=\ell g(\bar d^1_s)=\ell g(\bar d^2_t)$*, of course)*
- (b) $\langle(\bar c^2_t,\bar d^2_t) : s\in I_\ell\rangle$ *for* $\ell=1,2$ *are equivalent over* B_2 *(see* [Sh:93] *or* [Sh:715]*).*

Proof. Should be clear. $\square_{3.11}$

4. Consequences of strict decomposition

Here we look again at the generic pair conjecture ([Sh:877, 0.2]). The non-structure side (in a strong version) is proved there for $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ non-strong limit and in [Sh:906] for $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ strong limit (i.e. strongly inaccessible).
The conjecture is:

Conjecture 4.1. The generic pair conjecture
Assume [17] $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda} > |T|, 2^\lambda = \lambda^+, M_\alpha \in \mathrm{EC}_\lambda(T)$ is $\prec$-increasing continuous for $\alpha < \lambda^+$ with $\cup\{M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+\} \in \mathrm{EC}_{\lambda^+}(T)$ being saturated. Then T is dependent iff for some club E of λ^+ for all pairs $\alpha < \beta < \lambda^+$ from E of cofinality $\lambda^+, (M_\beta, M_\alpha)$ has the same isomorphism type.

We prove the "structure" side when $\lambda = \kappa$ is measurable. It seemed natural to assume that the first order theories of such pair is complicated if T is independent and "understandable" for dependent of T.

In fact, it may be better to ask

Problem 4.2. 1) Assume $|T| < \theta \leq \kappa \leq \lambda = \lambda^{<\kappa} < \kappa_2 \leq \mu = \mu^{<\aleph_2}$ and $M_1 \prec M_2 \prec \mathfrak{C}, M_1$ is κ_1-saturated of cardinality λ, M_2 is κ_2-saturated of cardinality μ. What can we say on $\mathrm{Th}(M_2, M_1)$? On $\mathrm{Th}_{\mathbb{L}_{\infty,\theta}(\tau(T))}(M_2, M_1)$?

More generally

Problem 4.3. Assume $n < \omega, |T| < \theta, \sigma_* < \theta_* < \kappa_0, \lambda_\ell = \lambda_\ell^{<\kappa_\ell}$ for $\ell \leq n, \lambda_\ell < \kappa_{\ell+1}$ for $\ell < n$. Let M_ℓ be κ_ℓ-saturated of cardinality λ_ℓ for $\ell \leq n$ and $M_\ell \prec M_{\ell+1}$ for $\ell < n$. What can we say on $M^+ =$ $\mathrm{Th}(M_n, M_1, M_0)$,i.e. M_n expanded by unary predicates for M_ℓ for $\ell < n$? When can we interpret (with first order formulas with parameters) second order logic on θ_3? i.e. classify T by this. Similarly for $\mathbb{L}_{\sigma,\sigma}(\tau_{M^+})$.

The proof here, if e.g. $\kappa = \lambda$ is measurable say that even the $\mathbb{L}_{\infty,\kappa}$-theory is constant, but does not say much even on the first order theory, (see [KpSh:946]). It is known that for $T =$ Peano arithmetic, in $\mathrm{Th}(M_2, M_1)$ we can interpret second order logic on $(\lambda, =)$.

Note that

Claim 4.4. *Assume T is the model completion of T_0, defined below so seems "the simplest" 2-independent theory. If $M_1 \in \mathrm{EC}_\lambda(T)$ and M_1 is a λ^+-saturated $\prec$-extension of M_0 then in (M_1, M_0) we can interpret second order logic on M_0 (i.e. quantification on two-place relations, when*

(∗) *τ_{T_0} consists of P_0, P_1, P_2 (unary predicates) and R (a ternary predicate) and a τ_{T_0}-model M is a model of T_0 iff $\langle P_0^M, P_1^M, P_2^M\rangle$ is a partition of $|M|$ and $R^M \subseteq P_0^M \times P_1^M \times P_2^M$.*

Proof. Obvious. $\square_{4.4}$

Also for $T =$ theory of Boolean algebras (which is n-independent for every n) the theory is complicated. Of course, it would be better to eliminate the measurable assumption.

---

[17] the "$2^\lambda = \lambda^+$" is just for making the formulation more transparent, and by absoluteness is equivalent

We first connect decomposition (i.e. the results of 3.5) and sufficient conditions for being an indiscernible sequence.

Claim 4.5. *Assume*

(a) $\bar{c}_\alpha \in {}^{\gamma(1)}\mathfrak{C}, \bar{d}_\alpha \in {}^{\gamma(2)}\mathfrak{C}$ *for* $\alpha < \alpha^*$, *let* $\bar{a}_\alpha = \bar{c}_\alpha \hat{} \bar{d}_\alpha$

(b) $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{a}_\alpha \hat{} \bar{a}_\beta, B) = p$ *for* $\alpha < \beta < \alpha^*$

(c) *if* $\alpha < \beta < \alpha^*$ *then* $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}_\beta, \bar{c}_\beta + \bar{d}_\alpha + B) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}_\beta, \bar{c}_\beta \cup \{\bar{a}_\gamma : \gamma \leq \alpha\} \cup B)$

(d) $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_\alpha, \cup\{\bar{a}_\beta : \beta < \alpha\} \cup B)$ *is increasing with* α

(e) $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_\alpha, \cup\{\bar{a}_\beta : \beta < \alpha\} \cup B)$ *does not split over* B.

Then $\langle \bar{a}_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$ *is an indiscernible sequence over* B.

Proof. For $u, v \subseteq \alpha^*$ let $B_{u,v} = \bigcup\{\bar{a}_\alpha : \alpha \in u\} \cup \bigcup\{\bar{c}_\alpha : \alpha \in v\} \cup B$. For $u, v \subseteq \alpha^*$ and increasing function h from $u \cup v$ to α^* let $f = f_{u,v,h}$ or $f = f_{h \restriction u, h \restriction v}$ be defined as follows:

⊛ (a) $\mathrm{Dom}(f_{u,v,u}) = B_{u,v}$

(b) $f \restriction B = \mathrm{id}_B$

(c) f maps $\bar{a}_\alpha$ to $\bar{a}_{h(\alpha)}$ for $\alpha \in u$

(d) f maps $\bar{c}_\alpha$ to $\bar{c}_{h(\alpha)}$ for $\alpha \in v$.

Is $f_{u,v,h}$ a well defined function and even one to one? For this we have to check the following three demands, which follows by clause (b) of the assumption

$(*)_1$ (α) if $\alpha, \beta < \alpha^*, b \in B$ and $i < \ell g(\bar{a}_\alpha)$ then $(\bar{a}_\alpha)_i = b \Leftrightarrow (\bar{a}_\beta)_i = b$

(β) if $\alpha, \beta < \alpha^*$ and $i, j < \ell g(\bar{a}_\alpha)$ then $(\bar{a}_\alpha)_i = (\bar{a}_\alpha)_j \Leftrightarrow (\bar{a}_\beta)_i = (\bar{a}_\beta)_j$

(γ) if $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \alpha^*$ and $\beta_1 < \beta_2 < \alpha^*$ and $i, j < \ell g(\bar{a}_\alpha)$ then $(\bar{a}_{\alpha_1})_i = (\bar{a}_{\alpha_2})_j \Leftrightarrow (\bar{a}_{\beta_1})_i = (\bar{a}_{\beta_1})_j$.

We prove by induction on n that $\langle \bar{a}_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$ is an n-indiscernible sequence over B (if $n < \alpha^*$). For $n \leq 2$ this is trivial by clause (b) of the assumption. So assume $n = m + 1 > 2$ and we have proved it up to m. So let $\alpha_0 < \ldots < \alpha_m < \alpha^*, \beta_0 < \ldots < \beta_m < \alpha^*$ and we shall prove that $\bar{a}_{\alpha_0} \hat{} \ldots \hat{} \bar{a}_{\alpha_m}, \bar{a}_{\beta_0} \hat{} \ldots \hat{} \bar{a}_{\beta_m}$ realizes the same type over B, this suffices.

Now by symmetry without loss of generality $\alpha_m \leq \beta_m$ let $h_0 = \{\langle \alpha_\ell, \beta_\ell \rangle : \ell < m\}, h_1 = \{(\alpha_\ell, \alpha_\ell) : \ell < m\}, h_2 = h_1 \cup \{\langle \alpha_m, \beta_m \rangle\}$ and $h_3 = h_0 \cup \{\langle \beta_m, \beta_m \rangle\}$ and $h_4 = h_0 \cup \{\langle \alpha_m, \beta_m \rangle\}$.

Let f_0 be the mapping f_{h_0,h_0}. By the induction hypothesis

$(*)_2$ f_0 is an elementary mapping.

Let f_1 be the mapping f_{h_1,h_2}, now by clause (d) of the assumption

$(*)_3$ f_1 is an elementary mapping.

By $(*)_2$ we know that $\bar{a}_{\alpha_0} \hat{} \ldots \hat{} \bar{a}_{\alpha_{m-1}}$ and $f_0(\bar{a}_{\alpha_0} \hat{} \ldots \hat{} \bar{a}_{\alpha_{m-1}})$ realizes the same type over B and they are included in $B_{\alpha_m,\alpha_m}, B_{\beta_m,\beta_m}$ respectively. But $\alpha_m \leq \beta_m$ so both sequences are from B_{β_m} hence by clause (e) of the assumption, i.e. as $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}_{\beta_m}, B_{\beta_m,\beta_m})$ does not split over B we have

$(*)_4$ $f_2 := f_{h_0,h_3}$ is an elementary mapping.

By $(*)_3 + (*)_4$, comparing we have

$(*)_5$ $f_3 := f_{h_0,h_4}$ being $f_2 \circ f_1$ is an elementary mapping.

Note that

$(*)_6$ $f_3(\bar{c}_{\alpha_m} \hat{\ } \bar{d}_{\alpha_{m-1}}) = \bar{c}_{\beta_m} \hat{\ } \bar{d}_{\beta_{m-1}}$.

By clause (b) of the assumption and $(*)_5$ and $(*)_6$ clearly

$(*)_7$ $f_3(\text{tp}(\bar{d}_{\alpha_m}, \bar{c}_{\alpha_m} + \bar{d}_{\alpha_{m-1}} + B)) = \text{tp}(\bar{d}_{\beta_m}, \bar{c}_{\beta_m} + \bar{d}_{\beta_{m-1}} + B)$.

By clause (c) of the asumption

$(*)_8$ $\text{tp}(\bar{d}_{\alpha_m}, \bar{c}_{\alpha_m} + \bar{d}_{\alpha_{m-1}} + B) \vdash \text{tp}(\bar{d}_{\alpha_m}, \bar{c}_{\alpha_m} + \bar{a}_{\alpha_0} + \ldots + \bar{a}_{\alpha_{m-1}} + B)$

$(*)_9$ $\text{tp}(\bar{d}_{\beta_m}, \bar{c}_{\beta_m} + \bar{d}_{\beta_{m-1}} + B) \vdash \text{tp}(\bar{d}_{\beta_n}, \bar{c}_{\beta_n} + \bar{a}_{\beta_0} + \ldots + \bar{a}_{\beta_{m-1}} + B)$.

Together $f_4 = f_{h_4,h_4}$ is an elementary mapping and it maps $\bar{a}_{\alpha_\ell}$ to $\bar{a}_{\beta_\ell}$ for $\ell \le m$ (and extend id_B) so we are done. $\square_{4.5}$

Observation 4.6. Assume

(a) $n < \omega$

(b) the linear order I is $I_0 + \ldots + I_n$ where I_ℓ is infinite for $\ell = 1, \ldots, n-1$

(c) $\langle (\bar{c}_t, \bar{d}_t) : t \in I_\ell \rangle$ is a strict_0 $(0,\theta)$-decomposition over (B^ℓ, B_ℓ) for $\ell \le n$

(d) $\langle \bar{c}_t \hat{\ } \bar{d}_t : t \in I_\ell + I_{\ell+1} \rangle$ is indiscernible over B^ℓ for $\ell < n$

(e) $B_\ell \subseteq B \subseteq B^0$

(f) $B^{\ell+1} \supseteq \{\bar{c}_t \hat{\ } \bar{d}_t : t \in I_\ell\} \cup B^\ell$.

Then $\langle (\bar{c}_t, \bar{d}_t) : t \in I \rangle$ is a strict_0 $(0,\theta)$-decomposition over (B^0, B).

Proof. Straightforward: we prove by induction on $k \le n$ that $\langle \bar{c}_t \hat{\ } \bar{d}_t : t \in \cup\{I_\ell : \ell \in [n-k, n]\}\rangle$ is an indiscernible sequence over B^{n-k}. For $k = 0, 1$ this holds by clause (d), for $k \ge 2$, let $s_0 <_I \ldots <_I s_{m-1}, t_0 <_I \ldots <_I t_{m-1}$ be from $\cup\{I_\ell : \ell \in [n-k, n]\}$ be given. Choose $s'_i, t'_i < m$ such that from $I_{n-k} \cup I_{n-k+1}$ such that $s'_0 <_I \ldots <_I s'_{m-1}, t'_0 <_I \ldots <_I t'_{m-1}$ and $s_\ell \in I_{n-k} \Rightarrow s'_\ell = s_\ell, s_\ell \notin I_{n-k} \Rightarrow s'_\ell \in I_{n-k+1}, t_\ell \in I_{n-k} \Rightarrow t'_\ell = t_\ell, t_\ell \notin I_{n-k} \Rightarrow t'_\ell \in I_{n-k+1}$ possible as I_{n-k+1} is infinite as $k \in [2, n]$.

Now $\text{tp}(\bar{a}_{s_0} \hat{\ } \ldots \hat{\ } \bar{a}_{s_{m-1}}, B^{n-k})$ by the induction hypothesis is equal to $\text{tp}(\bar{a}_{s_0} \hat{\ } \ldots \hat{\ } \bar{a}_{s'_{m-1}}, B^{n-k})$ which by clause (d) is equal to $\text{tp}(\bar{a}_{t'_0} \hat{\ } \ldots \hat{\ } \bar{a}_{t'_{m-1}}, B^{n-k})$ which by the induction hypothesis is equal to $\text{tp}(\bar{a}_{t_i} \hat{\ } \ldots \hat{\ } \bar{a}_{t_{m-1}}, B^{n-k})$ so we are done. $\square_{4.6}$

The following is a local version of 4.5

Claim 4.7. *Assume ($n(*) < \omega$ and $\alpha(*) > n(*)$)*

(a) $\bar{c}^m_\alpha \in {}^{\gamma(m,1)}\mathfrak{C}$ *for* $m \le n(*), \alpha < \alpha(*)$

(b) $\bar{d}_\alpha = \bar{d}^0_\alpha \in {}^{\gamma(m,0)}\mathfrak{C}$ *for* $\alpha < \alpha(*)$

(c) $\bar{c}^m_\alpha \triangleleft \bar{c}^{m+1}_\alpha$ *for* $\alpha < \alpha(*), m < n(*)$

(d) $\bar{e}^m_\alpha \in {}^{\gamma(m,2)}\mathfrak{C}$ *for non-zero* $m \le n(*), \alpha < \alpha(*)$

(e) *for each* $k < n(*)$, *for all* $\alpha < \beta < \alpha(*)$ *the type* $\text{tp}(\bar{c}^{k+1}_\beta \hat{\ } \bar{e}^{k+1}_\alpha \hat{\ } \bar{d}_\beta \hat{\ } \bar{e}^k_\beta, B)$ *is the same* (*f*) $\mathrm{tp}(\bar d_\beta \hat{}\, \bar e^m_\beta, \bar c^m_\beta + \bar e^{m+1}_\alpha + B) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(\bar d^m_\beta \hat{}\, \bar e^m_\beta, \bar c^m_\beta + \sum\limits_{\gamma<\beta} \bar c^m_\gamma \hat{}\, \bar d_\gamma + B)$

(*g*) $\mathrm{tp}(\bar c^k_\alpha, \cup\{\bar c^{k+1}_\beta \hat{}\, \bar e^{k+1}_\beta : \beta < \alpha, m < n(*)\} \cup B)$ *is increasing with* α

(*h*) $\mathrm{tp}(\bar c^k_\alpha, \cup\{\bar c^{k+1}_\beta \hat{}\, \bar d_\beta \hat{}\, \bar e^{k+1}_\beta : \beta < \alpha$ *and* $m < n(*)\} \cup B)$ *does not split over* B

(*i*) $\mathrm{tp}(\bar c^{n(*)}_\alpha \hat{}\, \bar d_\alpha \hat{}\, \bar e^k_\alpha, B)$ *is the same for all* $\alpha < \alpha(*)$.

Then $\langle \bar c^0_\alpha \hat{}\, \bar d_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$ *is an* $n(*)$*-indiscernible sequence over* B.

Proof. We prove by induction on $n < n(*)$ that

$\odot_1$ if $k \le n(*) - n$ and $\alpha_0 < \ldots < \alpha_n$ and $\beta_0 < \beta_1 < \ldots < \beta_n$ then
$\bar c^k_{\alpha_0} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\alpha_0} \hat{}\, \ldots \hat{}\, \bar c^k_{\alpha_{n-1}} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\alpha_{n-1}} \hat{}\, \bar c^k_{\alpha_n} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\alpha_n} \hat{}\, \bar e^k_{\alpha_n}$ and
$\bar c^k_{\beta_0} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\beta_0} \hat{}\, \ldots \hat{}\, \bar c^k_{\alpha_{n-1}} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\alpha_{n-1}} \hat{}\, \bar c^k_{\beta_n} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\beta_n} \hat{}\, \bar e^k_{\beta_n}$ realize the same type over B.

For $n = n(*) - 1, k = 0$ we get the desired conclusion.
For $n = 0$ this holds by clause (i) of the assumption. So assume $n = m + 1$ and $k \le n(*) - n$ and we have proved this for m. Note that $k + 1 \le n(*) - m$. So let $\alpha_0 < \ldots < \alpha_{m+1} < \alpha^*, \beta_0 < \ldots < \beta_{m+1} < \alpha^*$ and without loss of generality $\alpha_n \le \beta_n$ and we shall proof the equality of types from $\odot_1$ in this case, this suffice. Now

$(*)_1$ $\bar c^{k+1}_{\alpha_0} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\alpha_0} \hat{}\, \ldots \hat{}\, \bar c^{k+1}_{\alpha_{m-1}} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\alpha_{m-1}} \hat{}\, \bar c^{k+1}_{\alpha_m} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\alpha_m} \hat{}\, \bar e^{k+1}_{\alpha_m}$ and
$\bar c^{k+1}_{\beta_0} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\beta_0} \hat{}\, \ldots \hat{}\, \bar c^{k+1}_{\beta_{m-1}} \hat{}\, \bar d^{k+1}_{\alpha_{m-1}} \hat{}\, \bar c^{k+1}_{\alpha_m} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\alpha_m} \hat{}\, e^{k+1}_{\alpha_m}$ realize
the same type over B.

[Why? By the induction hypothesis.]

$(*)_2$ $\mathrm{tp}(\bar c^k_{\beta_n}, \cup\{\bar c^{k+1}_\gamma \hat{}\, \bar d_\gamma \hat{}\, \bar e^{k+1}_\gamma : \gamma < \beta_n\} \cup B)$ extends $\mathrm{tp}(\bar c^k_{\alpha_n}, \cup\{\bar c^{k+1}_\gamma \hat{}\, \bar d_\gamma \hat{}\, \bar e^{k+1}_\gamma : \gamma < \alpha_n\} \cup B)$ and does not split over B.

[Why? By clause (g) and by clause (h) of the assumption.]

$(*)_3$ $\mathrm{tp}(\bar c^k_{\beta_n}, \cup\{\bar c^{k+1}_\gamma \hat{}\, \bar d_\gamma \hat{}\, \bar e^{k+1}_\gamma : \gamma < \beta_n\} \cup B)$ does not split over B.

[Why? By clause (h) of the assumption.]

$(*)_4$ $\bar c^{k+1}_{\alpha_0} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\alpha_0} \hat{}\, \ldots \hat{}\, \bar c^{k+1}_{\alpha_{m-1}} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\alpha_{m-1}} \hat{}\, \bar c^{k+1}_{\alpha_m} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\alpha_m} \hat{}\, \bar e^{k+1}_{\alpha_m} \hat{}\, \bar c^k_{\beta_{m+1}}$ and
$\bar d^{k+1}_{\beta_0} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\beta_0} \hat{}\, \ldots \hat{}\, \bar c^{k+1}_{\beta_{m-1}} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\beta_{m-1}} \hat{}\, \bar c^{k+1}_{\beta_m} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\beta_m} \hat{}\, \bar e^{k+1}_{\beta_m} \hat{}\, \bar c^k_{\beta_{m+1}}$ realize
the same type over B.

[Why? By $(*)_1 + (*)_3$.]

$(*)_5$ in $(*)_4$ we can replace $\bar c^k_{\beta_{m+1}}$ in the first sequence by $\bar c^k_{\alpha_{m+1}}$.

[Why? By $(*)_4 + (*)_2$.] But

$(*)_6$ $(\bar c^{k+1}_{\alpha_{m+1}} \hat{}\, \bar e^{k+1}_{\alpha_m}) \hat{}\, (\bar d_{\alpha_{m+1}} \hat{}\, \bar e^k_{\alpha_{m+1}})$ and $(\bar c^{k+1}_{\beta_{m+1}} \hat{}\, \bar e^{k+1}_{\beta_m}) \hat{}\, (\bar d_{\beta_{m+1}} \hat{}\, \bar e^k_{\beta_{m+1}})$ realize the same type over B.

[Why? By clause (e) of the assumption.]

$(*)_7$ $\bar c^{k+1}_{\alpha_0} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\alpha_0} \hat{}\, \ldots \hat{}\, \bar c^{k+1}_{\alpha_{m-1}} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\alpha_{m-1}} \hat{}\, \bar c^{k+1}_{\alpha_m} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\alpha_m} \hat{}\, \bar c^{k+1}_{\alpha_{m+1}} \hat{}\, \bar d^m_{\alpha_{m+1}} \hat{}\, \bar e^k_{\beta_{m+1}}$ and
$\bar c^{k+1}_{\beta_0} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\beta_0} \hat{}\, \ldots \hat{}\, \bar c^{k+1}_{\beta_{m-1}} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\beta_{m-1}} \hat{}\, \bar c^{k+1}_{\beta_m} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\beta_m} \hat{}\, \bar c^{k+1}_{\beta_{m+1}} \hat{}\, \bar d_{\beta_{m+1}} \hat{}\, \bar e^k_{\beta_{m+1}}$
realize the same type over B.

[Why? By $(*)_5 + (*)_6$ and clause (f) of the assumption.]

As $\bar{c}^k_\gamma \triangleleft \bar{c}^{k+1}_\gamma$ by clause (c) of the assumption, we finish the induction step. Hence we get the desired statement. $\square_{4.7}$

* * *

We now return to the generic pair conjecture.

Definition 4.8. We say that the triple $(\lambda, \kappa, < \theta)$ is good or T-good when:

- (A) $|T| < \theta = \text{cf}(\theta) \le \kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa) \le \lambda = \lambda^{<\kappa}$
- (B) if M is κ-saturated of cardinality $\le \lambda$ then
  - (a) if $\bar{d} \in {}^{\theta >}\mathfrak{C}$ then we can find B and a strict $(\kappa, < \theta)$-decomposition $\langle (\bar{c}_n, \bar{d}_n) : n < \omega \rangle$ over (M, B), see 3.6 such that $\bar{d} \trianglelefteq \bar{d}_0$
  - (b) moreover 3.9 holds (true if 3.1 holds).

Claim 4.9. *Assume*

- (a) δ *is a limit ordinal* $< \theta = \text{cf}(\theta)$
- (b) $\langle (\bar{c}^\alpha_n, \bar{d}^\alpha_n) : n < \omega \rangle$ *is a strict* $(\kappa, < \theta)$*-decomposition over* (M, B_α) *for each* $\alpha < \delta$ *recalling Definition 3.6*
- (c) $\bar{c}^\alpha_n \trianglelefteq \bar{c}^\beta_n \wedge \bar{d}^\alpha_n \trianglelefteq \bar{d}^\beta_n$ *for* $\alpha < \beta < \delta, n < \omega$
- (d) $B_\alpha \subseteq B_\beta$ *for* $\alpha < \beta < \delta$
- (e) *we define* $\bar{c}^\delta_n = \cup\{\bar{c}^\alpha_n : \alpha < \delta\}, \bar{d}^\delta_n = \cup\{\bar{d}^\alpha_n : \alpha < \delta\}, B_\delta = \cup\{B_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\}$.

Then $\langle (\bar{c}^\delta_n, \bar{d}^\delta_n) : n < \omega \rangle$ *is a strict* $(\kappa, < \theta)$*-decomposition over* (M, B_δ).

Proof. We have to check clauses (a)-(f) of Definition 3.6. Clause (a) is trivial by assumption (b) of 4.9, clause (b) holds as $\delta < \theta = \text{cf}(\theta)$ by assumption (a) of 4.9 and clauses (c),(d),(e) hold by their local character and assumption (b) of 4.9. To prove clause (f) is the main point, it means to show

$\odot_1$ if $B_\delta \subseteq A \subseteq M$ and $|A| < \kappa$ then for some pair $(\bar{c}, \bar{d})$ of sequences from M we have $\langle \bar{c}{}^\frown \bar{d} \rangle {}^\frown \langle \bar{c}^\delta_n {}^\frown \bar{d}^\delta_n : n < \omega \rangle$ is an indiscernible sequence over A.

Now by induction on $\alpha < \delta$ we choose a pair $(\bar{c}^*_\alpha, \bar{d}^*_\alpha)$ such that

$\circledast_1$ $\langle \bar{c}^*_\alpha {}^\frown \bar{d}^*_\alpha \rangle {}^\frown \langle c^\alpha_n {}^\frown \bar{d}^\alpha_n : n < \omega \rangle$ is an indiscernible sequence over $A \cup \bigcup\{\bar{c}^*_\beta {}^\frown \bar{d}^*_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$.

[Why possible? We can choose $(\bar{c}^*_\alpha, \bar{d}^*_\alpha)$ because $\langle (\bar{c}^\alpha_n, \bar{d}^\alpha_n) : n < \omega \rangle$ being a strict $(\kappa, < \theta)$-decomposition over B_α, we can apply clause (f) of Definition 3.6 recalling B_α being a subset of $A \cup \{(\bar{c}^* {}^\frown \bar{d}^* : \beta < \alpha\}$ and the later being $\subseteq M$ and of cardinality $< \kappa$ as κ is regular $\ge \theta > \delta$.]

We can find $\langle (\bar{c}_\alpha, \bar{d}_\alpha) : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ though not necessarily in M such that

$\circledast_2$ (a) $\langle (\bar{c}_\alpha {}^\frown \bar{d}_\alpha) : \alpha < \delta \rangle {}^\frown \langle \bar{c}^\delta_n {}^\frown \bar{d}^\delta_n : n < \omega \rangle$ is an indiscernible sequence over A

(b) $\bar{c}^*_\alpha \trianglelefteq \bar{c}_\alpha$ and $\bar{d}^*_\alpha \trianglelefteq \bar{d}_\alpha$ for $\alpha < \delta$.

[Why? For this by using the saturation of $\mathfrak{C}$, it is enough to prove that: if $n < m < \omega, \alpha_0 < \ldots < \alpha_{n-1} < \delta$ then the sequences $\bar{c}^*_{\alpha_0} \hat{} \bar{d}^*_{\alpha_0} \hat{} \ldots \hat{} \bar{c}^*_{\alpha_{n-1}} \hat{} \bar{d}^*_{\alpha_{n-1}}$ $\bar{c}^{\alpha_0}_0 \hat{} \bar{d}^{\alpha_0}_0 \hat{} \bar{c}^{\alpha_1}_1 \hat{} \bar{d}^{\alpha_1}_1 \hat{} \ldots \hat{} \bar{c}^{\alpha_{n-1}}_{n-1} \hat{} \bar{d}^{\alpha_{n-1}}_{n-1}$ realize the same type over $A \cup \{\bar{c}^{\alpha_n}_k : k \in [n, m)\}$. This is proved by induction on $n < \omega$ and is straight.]

Hence we can find a pair $(\bar{c}', \bar{d}')$ such that

> $\circledast_3$ $\langle \bar{c}' \hat{} \bar{d}' \rangle \hat{} \langle (\bar{c}_\alpha \hat{} \bar{d}_\alpha) : \alpha < \delta \rangle \hat{} \langle \bar{c}^\delta_n : \bar{d}^\delta_n : n < \omega \rangle$ is an indiscernible sequence over A.

Lastly, we choose $(\bar{c}'', \bar{d}'')$ such that

> $\circledast_4$ $(\bar{c}'', \bar{d}'')$ is a pair of sequences from M realizing $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}' \hat{} \bar{d}', A \cup \bigcup \{\bar{c}^*_\alpha \hat{} \bar{d}^*_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\}$, equivalently there is an automorphism of $\mathfrak{C}$ which is the identity on $A \cup \bigcup \{\bar{c}^*_\alpha \hat{} \bar{d}^*_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\}$ mapping $\bar{c}' \hat{} \bar{d}'$ to $\bar{c}'' \hat{} \bar{d}''$.

We shall prove that $(\bar{c}'', \bar{d}'')$ is as required. Now to prove that $(\bar{c}'', \bar{d}'')$ is as required in $\odot_1$ it suffices to prove, for each $\alpha < \delta$ that

> $\odot_2$ $\langle \bar{c}'' \restriction \ell g(\bar{c}^\alpha_0) \hat{} \bar{d}'' \restriction \ell g(\bar{d}^\alpha_0) \rangle \hat{} \langle \bar{c}^\alpha_n \hat{} \bar{d}^\alpha_n : n < \omega \rangle$
> is an indiscernible sequence over A.

[Why? As $\odot_1$ is a "local" demand, i.e. it says that $\bar{c}'' \hat{} \bar{d}''$ is a sequence realizing an appropriate type q (and is from M) and for this it suffices to check every finite subtype so $\odot_2$ suffices.]

Now $\odot_2$ follows by $\circledast_6$ below. Let $(\bar{c}^*_{\beta,\gamma}, \bar{d}^*_{\beta,\gamma}) = (\bar{c}^*_\beta \restriction \ell g(\bar{c}^\gamma), \bar{d}^*_\beta \restriction \ell g(d^\gamma_0))$ and $(\bar{c}''_\gamma, \bar{d}''_\gamma)) = (\bar{c}'' \restriction \ell g(\bar{c}^\gamma_0), \bar{d}'' \restriction \ell g(\bar{d}^\gamma_0))$ for $\beta, \gamma < \delta$.

> $\circledast_5$ $\langle (\bar{c}''_\alpha, \bar{d}''_\alpha) \rangle \hat{} \langle (\bar{c}^*_{\beta,\alpha}, \bar{d}^*_{\beta,\alpha}) : \beta \in [\alpha, \delta) \rangle$ is a strict_0 decomposition over (B, B).

[Why? This holds for $\langle (\bar{c}' \restriction \ell g(\bar{c}^\alpha_0), \bar{d}' \restriction \ell g(\bar{c}^\alpha_0)) \rangle \hat{} \langle (\bar{c}^*_{\beta,\alpha}, \bar{d}^*_{\beta,\alpha}) : \beta \in [\alpha, \delta) \rangle$ and we use preservation by automorphism of $\mathfrak{C}$, i.e. use $\circledast_4$.]

> $\circledast_6$ For $\alpha < \delta$ and $i \leq \omega$ the sequence $\langle (\bar{c}''_\alpha, \bar{d}''_\alpha) \rangle \hat{} (\bar{c}^*_{\beta,\alpha}, \bar{d}^*_{\beta,\alpha}) : \beta \in [\alpha, \delta) \rangle \hat{} \langle (c^\alpha_n, \bar{d}^\alpha_n) : n < i \rangle$ is a strict_0 decomposition over (B, B).

[Why? We prove this by induction on i, so for $i = \omega$ we get the desired conclusion; also for $i = \omega$ the inductive step is trivial and for $i = 0$ use $\circledast_5$. So assume $i = n + 1$, let $B_1 = B \cup \mathrm{Rang}(\bar{c}''_\alpha) \cup \mathrm{Rang}(\bar{d}''_\alpha), B_2 = B_{2,\delta}$ where for $\gamma \in (\alpha, \delta]$ we let $B_{2,\gamma} = \cup \{\mathrm{Rang}(\bar{c}^*_{\beta,\alpha}) \cup \mathrm{Rang}(\bar{d}^*_{\beta,\alpha}) : \beta \in [\alpha, \delta)\}, B_3 = \cup \{\bar{c}^\alpha_\ell \hat{} \bar{d}^\alpha_\ell : \ell < n\}$.

Let $\gamma \in (\alpha, \delta)$ be a successor ordinal and we shall prove that $(c^*_{\gamma,\alpha} \hat{} \bar{d}^*_{\gamma,\alpha}) \hat{} \ldots \hat{} (\bar{c}^*_{\gamma,n,\alpha} \hat{} \bar{d}^*_{\gamma+n,\alpha})$ and $(\bar{c}^\alpha_0 \hat{} \bar{d}^\alpha_0) \hat{} \ldots \hat{} (\bar{c}^\alpha_n \hat{} \bar{d}^\alpha_n)$ realize the same type over $B_1 \cup B_{2,\gamma}$, as δ is a limit ordinal this suffices. Now $(\bar{c}^*_{\gamma,\alpha} \hat{} \bar{d}^*_{\gamma,\alpha}) \hat{} \ldots \hat{} (\bar{c}^*_{\gamma+n-1,\alpha} \hat{} \bar{d}^*_{\gamma+n-1,\alpha})$ and $(\bar{c}^\alpha_0 \hat{} \bar{d}^\alpha_0) \hat{} \ldots \hat{} (\bar{c}^\alpha_{n-1} \hat{} \bar{d}^\alpha_{n-1})$ realize the same type over $B_1 \cup B_{2,\gamma}$ by the induction hypothesis. Now $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}^\alpha_n, M \cup \bigcup \{\bar{c}^\alpha_m \hat{} \bar{d}^\alpha_m : m < n\})$ does not split over B hence $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{c}^\alpha_n, B \cup B_1 \cup B_2, B_3)$ does not split over M.

By $\circledast_5$ we can choose $\bar{d}'$ in $\mathfrak{C}$ such that $(\bar{c}^*_{\gamma,\alpha} \hat{} \bar{d}_{\gamma,n}) \hat{} \ldots \hat{} (\bar{c}^*_{\gamma+n-1,\alpha} \hat{} \bar{d}^*_{\gamma+n-1,\alpha}) \hat{} (\bar{c}^*_{\gamma+n,\alpha} \hat{} \bar{d}')$ and $(\bar{c}^\alpha_0 \hat{} \bar{d}^\alpha_0) \hat{} \ldots \hat{} (\bar{c}^\alpha_{n-1} \hat{} \bar{d}^\alpha_{n-1}) \hat{} (\bar{c}^\alpha_n \hat{} \bar{d}^\alpha_n)$ realize the same type over $B_1 \cup B_{2,\gamma}$ so it suffices to prove that $\bar{d}^*_{\gamma+n,\alpha}, \bar{d}'$ realize the same type over $B_1 \cup B_{2,\gamma+n}$.

By the transitivity of the equality of types $d^*_{\gamma+n,\alpha}, d'$ realizes the same type over $(\bar{c}^*_{\gamma-1,\alpha} \hat{} \bar{d}^*_{\gamma_1,\alpha}) \hat{} (\bar{c}^*_{\gamma,\alpha} \hat{} \bar{d}^*_{\gamma,\alpha}) \hat{} \ldots \hat{} (\bar{c}^*_{\gamma+n-1} \hat{} \bar{d}^*_{\gamma+n-1}) \hat{} \bar{c}^*_{\gamma+n}$, but $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}^*_{\gamma+n,\alpha}, \bar{c}^*_{\gamma+n,\gamma} + \bar{d}^*_{\gamma+n-1,\alpha}) \vdash \mathrm{tp}(\bar{d}^*_{\gamma+n,\alpha}, B_1 + B_{2,\gamma+n} + \bar{c}^*_{\gamma+n,\alpha})$ so we are done.] $\square_{4.9}$

Clearly 4.9 is a step forward. Now we prove, using e.g. a measurable, the generic pair conjecture.
Toward this

Definition 4.10. We say that the triple $(M, N, \mathcal{A})$ is a $(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$-system when ($\lambda \geq \kappa \geq \theta = \mathrm{cf}(\theta) > |T|$ and)

- (a) M, N are κ-saturated of cardinality λ
- (b) $M \prec N \prec \mathfrak{C}$
- (c) $\mathcal{A}$ is a set of cardinality λ of tuples $\langle (\bar{c}_n, \bar{d}_n) : n < \omega \rangle$ such that
  - (α) $\bar{c}^n_0 {}^\frown \bar{d}^n_0 \subseteq N$ and $\bar{c}_{n+1} {}^\frown \bar{d}_{n+1}$ is disjoint to $N \backslash M$
  - (β) $\langle (\bar{c}_n, \bar{d}_n) : n < \omega \rangle$ is a strict $(\kappa, < \theta)$-decomposition over M
- (d) $\mathcal{A}$ is partially ordered by $\langle (\bar{c}'_n, \bar{d}'_n) : n < \omega \rangle \leq \langle (\bar{c}''_n, \bar{d}''_n) : n < \omega \rangle$ iff $\bar{c}'_m \trianglelefteq \bar{c}''_n, \bar{d}'_n \trianglelefteq \bar{d}''_n$ for every $n < \omega$
- (e) $\mathcal{A}$ is closed under union of $< \theta$ increasing chains of length $< \theta$
- (f) if $\langle (\bar{c}_n {}^\frown \bar{d}_n) : n < \omega \rangle \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\bar{d} \in {}^{\theta >} N$ then for some $\langle \bar{c}'_n {}^\frown d'_n : n < \omega \rangle$ above $\langle \bar{c}_n {}^\frown \bar{d}_n : n < \omega \rangle$ we have $\bar{d} \subseteq \mathrm{Rang}(\bar{d}'_n)$.

Definition 4.11. If $(M_\ell, N_\ell, \mathcal{A}_\ell)$ is a $(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$-system for $\ell = 1, 2$ we say $(M_2, N_2, \mathcal{A}_2)$ is above $(M_1, N_1, \mathcal{A}_1)$ or $(M_1, N_1, \mathcal{A}_1) \subseteq (M_2, N_2, \mathcal{A}_2)$ when $M_1 = M_2, N_1 \prec N_2$ and $\mathcal{A}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{A}_2$.

Claim 4.12. *Assume $\kappa = \lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ and $(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$ is T-good (see Definition 4.8).*
1) If $M \prec \mathfrak{C}$ is κ-saturated of cardinality λ then there is a pair $(N, \mathcal{A})$ such that $(M, N, \mathcal{A})$ of a $(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$-system.
2) If $(M, N_1, \mathcal{A}_1)$ is a $(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$-system and $N_1 \prec N_2 \prec \mathfrak{C}$ and $\|N_2\| = \lambda$ then there is a pair $(N_3, \mathcal{A}_3)$ such that $(M, N_3, \mathcal{A}_3)$ is a $(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$-system above $(M, N_1, \mathcal{A}_1)$ and $N_2 \prec N_3$.
3) If $\langle (M, N_\varepsilon, \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon) : \varepsilon < \delta \rangle$ is an increasing sequence of $(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$-systems and δ is a limit ordinal $< \lambda^+$ then there is a $(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$-system which is an upper bound of $\{(M, N_\varepsilon, \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon) : \varepsilon < \delta\}$.
4) If in part (3) we have $\mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \lambda$ then $(M, \bigcup\limits_{\alpha < \delta} N_\alpha, \bigcup\limits_{\alpha < \delta} \mathcal{A}_\alpha)$ is such an upper bound.

Proof. Straight. $\square_{4.12}$

Conclusion 4.13. If $(\lambda, \lambda, \lambda)$ is a T-good, $\lambda^+ = 2^\lambda$, $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ is an $\prec$-increasing continuous sequence of members of $\mathrm{EC}_\lambda(T)$, M_α saturated if α is non-limit and $M = \cup \{M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+\}$ is saturated then for some club E of λ^+ for any $\alpha < \beta < \delta \in E$ and α, β are non-limit, the pairs (M_δ, M_α) and (M_δ, M_β) are isomorphic.

Proof. Straight. $\square_{4.13}$

Another form

Conclusion 4.14. Assume $(\lambda, \lambda, \lambda)$ is T-good, e.g. $\lambda > |T|$ is a measurable cardinality and $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$. For some function $\mathbf{F}$ as in $\odot$ below (as in [Sh:88r, 3.3] if $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ obeys $\mathbf{F}$ see $\boxdot$ below), then

- (a) $\mathrm{cf}(\alpha) \equiv \lambda \Rightarrow M_\alpha$ is saturated
- (b) if M_α, M_β are saturated and $\alpha, \beta < \delta$ and $\mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \lambda$ then $(M_\delta, M_\alpha) \cong (M_\delta, M_\beta)$.

$\odot$ (a) $\mathbf{F}$ is a function with domain $\{\bar{M} : \bar{M}$ has the form $\langle M_i : i \le \beta\rangle$, a $\prec$-increasing continuous sequence such that M_i is models of T of cardinality λ with universe an ordinal $\in [\lambda, \lambda^+)$ and if i is non-limit then M_i is saturated$\}$

(b) $\mathbf{F}(\bar{M})$ is such that $\bar{M}\char`^\langle \mathbf{F}(\bar{M})\rangle \in$ Dom$(\mathbf{F})$

$\boxdot$ $\bar{M} = \langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$ obeys $\mathbf{F}$ when $\lambda^+ = \sup\{\alpha : \mathbf{F}(\bar{M} \restriction (\alpha + 1) \prec M_{\alpha+1}\}$.

Remark 4.15. Note that in 4.14, for some club E of λ^*, if cf$(\alpha) = \lambda =$ cf$(\beta), \alpha < \delta \in E, \beta < \delta \in E$ then $(M_\delta, M_\alpha) \cong (M_\delta, M_\beta)$.

References

[CK73] Chen C. Chang and H. Jerome Keisler, *Model Theory*, Studies in Logic and the Foundation of Math., vol. 73, North–Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1973.

[Ehr57] Andrzej Ehrenfeucht, *On theories categorical in power*, Fundamenta Mathematicae **44** (1957), 241–248.

[KM78] Akihiro Kanamori and Menachem Magidor, *The evolution of large cardinal axioms in set theory*, Higher Set Theory, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 669, Springer – Verlag, 1978, pp. 99–275.

[Sh:c] Saharon Shelah, *Classification theory and the number of nonisomorphic models*, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, vol. 92, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, xxxiv+705 pp, 1990.

[Sh:3] ______, *Finite diagrams stable in power*, Annals of Mathematical Logic **2** (1970), 69–118.

[Sh:72] ______, *Models with second-order properties. I. Boolean algebras with no definable automorphisms*, Annals of Mathematical Logic **14** (1978), 57–72.

[Sh:88r] ______, *Abstract elementary classes near* $\aleph_1$, Chapter I. 0705.4137. 0705.4137.

[Sh:93] ______, *Simple unstable theories*, Annals of Mathematical Logic **19** (1980), 177–203.

[Sh:300] ______, *Universal classes*, Classification theory (Chicago, IL, 1985), Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1292, Springer, Berlin, 1987, Proceedings of the USA–Israel Conference on Classification Theory, Chicago, December 1985; ed. Baldwin, J.T., pp. 264–418.

[Sh:300a] ______, *Chapter I.*

[Sh:715] ______, *Classification theory for elementary classes with the dependence property - a modest beginning*, Scientiae Mathematicae Japonicae **59, No. 2; (special issue: e9, 503–544)** (2004), 265–316, math.LO/0009056.

[Sh:783] ______, *Dependent first order theories, continued*, Israel Journal of Mathematic **173** (2009), 60 pp., math.LO/0406440.

[Sh:863] ______, *Strongly dependent theories*, Israel Journal of Mathematics **accepted**, math.LO/0504197.

[Sh:868] ______, *When first order T has limit models*, Algebra Universalis **submitted**, math.LO/0603651.

[Sh:877] ______, *Dependent T and Existence of limit models*, Tbilisi Mathematical Journal **submitted**, math.LO/0609636.

[Sh:906] ______, *No limit model in inaccessibles*, Proceedings of the Makkaifest **submitted**, 0705.4131.

[KpSh:946] Itay Kaplan and Saharon Shelah, *Dependent examples*, preprint.

[Sh:950] Saharon Shelah, *A dependent dream and recounting types.*

Einstein Institute of Mathematics, Edmond J. Safra Campus, Givat Ram, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, 91904, Israel, and, Department of Mathematics, Hill Center - Busch Campus, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 110 Frelinghuysen Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019 USA

E-mail address: `shelah@math.huji.ac.il`

URL: `http://shelah.logic.at`